

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR APRIL, 1844.

Art. 1. *Lives of Eminent British Statesmen: Thomas Osborne Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds.* By the Right Hon. Thomas P. Courtenay. London : Longmans. 1838.

THERE are some characters in history whose fame is derived from nothing within themselves, but only from the time in which they lived, or the peculiar circumstances with which they were connected. Apart from these, we should care little about them, whilst yet so curiously identified are they with these, that their memoirs interest us exceedingly. The subject of this article, for instance, would have barely passed muster in the present day, as a junior lord of the treasury or admiralty; whilst such was his singular fortune, in having brought about a marriage which changed the dynasty of these kingdoms,—in having governed them himself for several years as prime minister to Charles the Second—and in having been amongst the principal advisers of William the Third, that we are glad to study his biography, as though he had been a personage of genuine worth and ability. The mine may look dull upon its surface, but is well worth working below.

He was the eldest son of Sir Edward Osborne, a baronet of Yorkshire, whose grandfather laid, in the reign of Elizabeth, 'the foundation of greatness by an act of bravery and humanity.' Having been apprenticed to Sir William Hewitt, a rich metropolitan merchant, who had an only child, and that a daughter, he preserved her life, at the imminent hazard of his own. Little Anne was accidentally dropped by her nurse from the window of her father's house on London Bridge: upon

which, young Osborne plunged into the river, rescued her from a watery grave, and ultimately married her. As an heiress she endowed him with estates in Yorkshire and Essex to the extent of six thousand pounds per annum. Her portion in hard cash also proved considerable; with which her husband traded so successfully, that wealth poured in upon him like water. He lived to serve the offices of sheriff and lord mayor,—sat in parliament for the city,—was knighted by the queen,—and obtained for his family an accession to one of the earliest baronetcies in England. Respecting the son of this prosperous gentleman there is no record; but his grandson proved a royalist, and a follower of Strafford. Toryism thus sprang up strong and early; and was not a little strengthened by the alliance of Sir Edward with a lady, who represented the ancient line of Neville Lord Latimer. Their son, the future minister, was born in 1631; and was kept either in the seclusion of a rural life, or sent abroad, until after the restoration of the Stuarts. According to the best contemporaneous testimony, he had enlisted himself, from the very commencement, ‘among the high cavaliers.’ His first appearance in public life was at the age of thirty, when in the lifetime of his father he became member for York, in that Long Parliament which met in May, 1661, and entailed so many miseries upon these nations. He soon busied himself, together with others like-minded, in brewing as much mischief as possible. Burnet assures us, that he offered the king an augmentation of revenue and power; which only means that he was ready to spend and be spent, if the royal despot might have been but permitted to trample out the life-blood of British liberty. Even Clarendon felt that he would have gone too far: and Osborne therefore learned to hate the lord chancellor, because that proud minister at least professed to be more moderate in his measures. Hyde’s fresh nobility perhaps exasperated his chagrin; for Osborne already began to weigh his own claims. His father had zealously supported Charles I.; and his wife, whom he had married in 1652, was the second daughter of Lord Lindsay, who had fought for royalism in some of the stoutest struggles of the civil war.

His lot being thus cast, as it might seem for life, with those who loved oppression and despised the people, we may set down any occasional deviations from their line of conduct to pure selfishness, displayed just now and then through a love of contradiction, or perverse ambition for notoriety. We are told that one of his earliest votes was in opposition to a bill introduced at Oxford in 1665 for obliging all persons to avouch the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the king, or any persons commissioned by him. One swallow does not make a summer,

nor a single flight of patriotism a genuine lover of his country. His biographer, a moderate conservative, with much fairness observes, that 'if the vote was given, it must probably be ascribed to the spirit of opposition operating in a young mind.' Senators are but puppets, although our author, himself a privy councillor, 'cannot recognize *the very remarkable providence* by which, according to John Locke, the bill was 'thrown out.' We regret this sneer at a particular and overruling appointment, which beyond all doubt orders everything both in heaven and earth. The obnoxious measure would have tortured non-conformists and conscientious roundheads more than even his right honourable admirer considers necessary; and it struck a pious philosopher as sufficiently remarkable, that Sir Thomas Osborne and his brother, having that very morning introduced Mr. Peregrine Bertie, whose sister the former had married, to his new seat in parliament, these three individuals just formed the majority which turned the scale. We wholly despair of being ever able to teach our political opponents the agonies of a vexed conscience, as our favourite Sir Harry Vane used to term it. The future Earl of Danby had often to illustrate the force of that Scripture, 'Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee; and the remainder thereof shalt Thou restrain.' His office, painful as it appears to have proved to himself, frequently was to do good against his will. In 1667 he took an active part in the proceedings against Lord Clarendon. His neighbour in Yorkshire, Sir John Reresby, assures us that he was the Buckingham of the House of Commons, with respect to the Lord Chancellor. Osborne had long foretold, his wish being perhaps father to the thought, that 'the chancellor would be accused of treason, and then if he were not hanged, he would be hanged himself!' Alas! for the unmerited destinies of these worthy candidates for the gallows. But so it was then, as now. Diamond cut diamond under the splendid auspices of rank, wealth, title, and power; a fact which posterity renders into the most sensible aphorism, that 'When rogues fall out by the way, there is a possible chance of honesty coming by its own!' The member for York hunted down his noble enemy night and day. Not Pym, nor Hampden, could have pressed upon a traitor with more energy. He threaded all the labyrinths of court and cabinet, from the purlieus of the palace to the waiting-rooms of coffee-houses, to collect evidence against the obnoxious minister. The records inform us upon what shallow evidence some of the charges in the case of Clarendon were based; as for example, about the sale of Dunkirk: 'Sir Thomas Osborne said, that *a great lord told him*, that the earl had made a bargain for that town three quarters of a year before it was

known!' Our opinion with regard to Lord Clarendon is well known: but the heart grows sick in contemplating the recklessness with which hypocrisy pursued covetousness, during those golden days, when an established church dared to return her thanks to Almighty God 'for his miraculous loving-kindness in placing that most gracious sovereign King Charles the Second on the throne of these kingdoms, thereby restoring us the free profession of true religion and worship, together with our former peace and prosperity, to the great comfort and joy of our hearts!' By what drug from the laboratory of Satan, have bishops and presbyters remained steeped in carelessness to the current moment, so as to suffer this detestable office to continue unerased from the Book of Common Prayer, for the use of episcopalians throughout England and Ireland?

Sir Thomas Osborne had been thrown, during his earlier years, into the society of his great contemporary, Sir William Temple. They had been young travellers together, and tennis players in France. They now acted in unison upon a nobler arena, in representing Clarendon as not only an enemy of Spain, but a dependant of France. Dislike of all French connexion, leanings toward Holland, and towards Spain also, as interested with Holland in the preservation of the Netherlands from France, were now the prevalent principles of the country party in England. Osborne assumed these as a political creed, just as Anthony Fire-the-Faggot, in the romance of Kenilworth, assumed his religious one, to be put on or pulled off like an easy glove, according to circumstances. He also became a violent abhorror of popery with similar facility of profession, ready to turn this way or that, as fortune, necessity, or expediency might beckon him. Hence we find him now pleading his ultra-loyalism, at the Restoration, to obtain office under the infamous Cabal. The friend of Temple,—the ardent member of the protestant Church of England,—the antagonist of Romanism,—and the denouncer of a premier because his foreign policy had seemed to favour Louis the Fourteenth, was appointed to the treasurership of the navy in 1670. The following year beheld him sworn of that privy council, at which Clifford of Chudleigh and Lord Arlington would have bartered away the throne of their master, the religion of his people, or the liberties and welfare of the realm, for foreign gewgaws and attractive mistresses. 'It may excite surprise,' observes his temperate biographer, 'that Osborne should connect himself with such a government, by office, just at this period; but we are not to measure his consistency by 'the standard used in our days.' We presume not, indeed; but as impartial critics we must, of course, represent matters in their real light. Here is a political character, who, we are assured, 'has scarcely met with

justice either contemporaneous or posthumous,' linking himself in base and wretched servitude, under ministers whose entire plans and proceedings he had promised and professed to hold in utter detestation. Is it really true, then, that all the virtues had ranged themselves under liberalism in the seventeenth century? How striking is the contrast between the courtiers and aristocracy of the Restoration, and the soldiers and heroes of the commonwealth! Clarendon had fallen, only to make room for five favourites, whose initials constitute a political name of reproach, which will never be forgotten. Had all the witches that ever haunted the imagination of Sir Matthew Hale, or the American puritans, combined their sorcery, no compound from their infernal cauldron could have exceeded in potency of mischief that cabinet of atrocious transgressors then permitted to curse both crown and country. The six years from 1667 to 1673 were the emptying of so many vials of wrath upon a polluted land. In the teeth of the Triple Alliance his majesty was literally selling himself to Rouvigny, an agent from Paris, for just as much money as might be extorted from the Grand Monarque. At home, the three kingdoms lay drenched in profligacy and iniquity. Liberty and religion, virtue, and even decency, had to veil their faces for very shame. Prerogative and bigotry were smothering justice and toleration. Not that Charles, as he once told Lord Essex, wished to sit like a Turkish sultan, and sentence men to the bowstring; 'but he could not bear that a set of fellows should inquire into his conduct!' An illustration this of a genuine George the Fourth; and the modified slavery which even modern toryism would fain inflict upon the masses. About the period that Sir Thomas Osborne was reaping his first harvest from the powers that then were, his sovereign had arranged with Louis in secret to change the religion, by law established, from protestantism to popery; and introduce arbitrary sway. His government plunged into another Dutch war, during which immense sums were paid by France to the needy Stuart; part of the province of Zealand, when conquered, was to be handed over to England, as the wages of her perfidy; and the young prince of Orange himself had his integrity laid siege to, that he might be induced to participate in this horrible scheme of coalescing against European freedom.

Well might the British nation have looked back upon the horrors even of civil war, and sighed in the bitterness of its spirit. Valour, and wisdom, and eloquence, were then the high roads at least to fame, if not to official advancement also. But now how mortifying and disgraceful appeared the change. The helm of affairs fell into the hands of courtezans, or their imme-

diate parasites. Bishop Burnet thus describes the course of events at the time Osborne was creeping into distinction : ‘This year the king declared a new mistress, and made her Duchess of Portsmouth. She had been maid of honour to his sister, and had come over with her to Dover ; where the king had expressed such a regard to her, that Buckingham, who hated the Duchess of Cleveland, (the reigning harlot,) intended to put this new one on his majesty. He assured Louis the Fourteenth, that he could never reckon himself certain of the king, *but by giving him a mistress, that should be true to his interests.* It was soon agreed to. So the Duke of Buckingham sent her with a part of his equipage to Dieppe ; and said, he would presently follow. But he, who was the most inconstant and forgetful of all men, never thought of her more ; **but** went to England by the way of Calais. So Montague, then **ambassador** at Paris, hearing of this, sent over for a yacht for her, and sent some of his servants to wait on her, and defray her charge, till she was brought to Whitehall ; and then Lord Arlington took care of her. The Duke of Buckingham thus lost the merit he might have pretended to ; and brought over a mistress, whom his own strange conduct threw into the scale of his rivals. The king was presently taken with her. She studied to please and observe him in every thing ; so that he passed away the rest of his life in great fondness for her. He kept her at a vast charge. And she by many fits of sickness, some pretended, some real, gained of him everything she desired. *She stuck firm to the French interest, and was its chief support !* This incident constitutes but a single leaf in the volume of scandal, oppression, debauchery, and intrigue, which make up the reign of Charles the Second. Britain was then sacrificed without remorse, by the prince whom Osborne was about to serve, between the grossest violations of the seventh and tenth commandments. With prostitutes for his companions, and a foreign potentate for his paymaster, he mocked at the clergy who were enshrining him in their sanctuaries and prayers, every twenty-ninth of May ; and robbed or insulted his subjects as opportunities offered. The court and privy purse had been accumulating debt ever since the Restoration ; whilst for the maintenance of public credit, Charles had assigned over several branches of his revenue to some bankers ; besides pledging his faith to them, in successive proclamations, that ‘he would continue to make good all his assignments, until the whole debt should be paid, which was now growing up to £1,500,000 !’ But woe to those who put their trust in princes. His majesty all at once shut up his exchequer ; the bankers broke ; and multitudes, who had trusted their property with them, beheld ruin at their doors. His ministers could not fail

being cognizant of the royal perfidy ; for Lord Shaftesbury had withdrawn his own money, and even hinted to his friends, that they should follow his example. Then ensued the attempted seizure of the Dutch Smyrna fleet, contrary to an article in the Peace of Breda, that no merchandize should be arrested on the high seas, until full six months had elapsed from the proclamation of war. In addition to such avowals of treachery and bankruptcy, the suspension of all penal laws with regard to religion was ordered : not that any rights of conscience were to be vindicated,—but only that an act of sheer naked autoocracy might supersede the constitution and law of the land. Nonconformity had too much honesty to fall in, even with its own emancipation, on such terms.

Nor did Sir Thomas Osborne perceive it to be his interest to remain any longer silent. The plunder of merchants at home, or the unsuccessful efforts against those abroad, involving towards Holland, ‘a breach of faith such as Mahometans and pirates would have been ashamed of,’ had permitted him to remain unperturbed in his rich office at the Navy Board ; but now an established church being indirectly struck at, under which he dispensed considerable patronage in Essex and Yorkshire, his voice began to be heard and listened to in the House of Commons. When parliament assembled for its tenth session, on the 4th of February, 1673, it soon appeared how completely aristocracy and prelacy understand one another. Doctor Lingard also tells us, that a system had been introduced by Clarendon, to use a certain class of courtiers, as straws thrown up to show which way the breath of public opinion might be blowing. With this view, they were sometimes instructed to conceal their sentiments, or at least act for the time being with the popular party. Accordingly, we have the Treasurer of the Navy quite prominent amongst those who addressed the crown during the month of March, against the dispensing power exercised in favour of dissenters. Together with Messrs. Meres and Powle, leading patriots of their day, he contended and conquered. The house and its sovereign endeavoured to take each other by the ears, after a fashion, which furnished interminable jokes for Hudibras ; and which might have afforded Hogarth materials for a political Rake’s Progress, from knavery to ruin, on an almost national scale. To the glance of an uninitiated spectator, it would have seemed as though the strange anomaly were presented of a placeman combining with an opposition, to coerce the court out of one of its favourite measures. Not that there was an identity of sentiment between the member for York and the colleagues, with whom to serve a particular purpose, he just then acted. Their desire was to withstand popery and despotism :

'his to maintain that form of protestantism only, which is in the church of England.' Upon the Test Act he concurred equally with them and his superiors in the ministry; foreseeing, with the sagacity of a rat, that the latter would drop to pieces from its operation. Upon the unsuccessful Bill, which speedily followed the Test Act, for relieving nonconformists from its pressure, 'Osborne was separated from his new associates, equally as a churchman and a cavalier.' He at once sprung back to the less liberal, which was in fact his natural side. A few imperfect notes have been preserved of his harangue against any surrender even of assent and consent to the doctrinal articles, or a renunciation of the covenant: 'Does think this most unreasonable, and cannot consent to it. It is both to the king and to this house: to the king, because we should seem to encourage the wickedness of those men; to the house, because of the vote. No man he thinks, would ever come in; and he would exclude them. It is a great scandal to bring them in by special act of parliament; the nation groans under it; and he thinks they would return into rebellion?' So far as we may infer from such moonstruck hallucinations, Sir Thomas only abhorred the pope, because he was not an Anglican archbishop of Canterbury. His speeches grew more and more frequent on behalf of government; his biographer remarks, that—

'On a proposal for delaying the Money Bill until the Test Act should have passed, he urged the propriety of reposing confidence in the king, and of placing our fleet on a footing with that of the Dutch, with whom England was now again at war. But the reports of the parliamentary addresses of those days do not assist us in ascertaining, whether at this early period of his career, Osborne gave proofs of that skilfulness in debate, and superior understanding, which Lord Dartmouth, who knew him later, and in the House of Lords, largely ascribes to him! The ministers were successful in passing their money Bill; and the Commons got little further than the assertion of their grievances. These consisted in England, of a convoy duty illegally imposed, and of abuses in the quartering and keeping of soldiers. The Irish grievances will show what different forms the *liberality of a faction* assumes. The prayer of the party now was, that no papist should be admitted into the army of Ireland, or to hold any judicial or municipal office, or even to reside, in a corporate town.'—p. 207.

Mr. Courtenay may have notions of his own, as to what he considers 'the liberality of a faction.' But as an impartial historian, he should be careful in brandishing such two-edged swords; lest, in making sly hits at his honest opponents, his weapon may chance to mow down a set of dishonest prejudices on the conservative side. It would have been more to the purpose, had he dwelt upon the probabilities or improbabilities of

his hero ever exhibiting either ‘skilfulness in debate,’ or ‘superior understanding.’ The subject of this paper, possessed an intellect which may be gauged, and weighed, and measured, to a nicety. Had any fond flatterer expressed his apprehensions lest such talents should be buried in a napkin, Robert Hall would have answered, that a very small pocket handkerchief might completely answer the purpose. Our author ought also to have mentioned, what he has omitted, that the House of Commons, in voting large supplies on this occasion, avoided every recognition of the Dutch war, with an implicitness which covered them with honour. They would not betray the security of our coasts, by unseasonable parsimony, but the sums were expressed as granted for ‘the extraordinary occasions of his majesty.’ The dissenters and patriots well enough knew that to accomplish their best objects, they must blend the wisdom of the serpent, with the endurance and harmlessness of the dove. Their sovereign was a hollow, profligate hypocrite. An almost omnipresent hierarchy sat at his feet, with more than papal adulation, ready to proclaim his divine right of reigning, if he would but attach his sceptre to their wealth, immunities, and privileges; which he was profuse in his promises of being willing to do. The peerage was a vulture, its beak ever gnawing into the vitals of the country, like the bird of torture to Prometheus! The House of Lords, says Hallam, ‘contained unfortunately an invincible majority for the court, prompt to frustrate any legislative security for public liberty. Thus the Habeas Corpus Act, first sent up to that house in 1674, was lost there in several successive sessions. The Commons therefore testified their sense of public grievances, and kept alive an alarm in the nation by resolutions and addresses, which a phlegmatic reader is sometimes too apt to consider factious or unnecessary.’ In the next session of the same year as that in which the Test Act passed, to which nonconformists, through evil report and good report, laudably gave their suffrages, though of course without any compromise of their genuine attachment to religious liberty, the country party succeeded in banishing Buckingham from the palace, and in intimidating Arlington into a change of policy. Sir Thomas Osborne, on the 19th of the intervening June, obtained his high appointment as Lord Treasurer of England. It was always conferred by the presentation of a white staff, and had attached to it an income of £8,000 per annum, besides immense patronage and perquisites. Bishop Burnet tells us, that his estate was become a good deal impaired at this time: which, if true, must have made such vast emolument still more agreeable to him. What his majesty valued most, was freedom from trouble and care, being a perfect Vitellius in his own way:—

umbraculis hortorum abditus, ut ignava animalia, quibus si cibum suggeras, jacent torpentque, præterita instantia futura pari obliuione dimiserat! The new premier well knew this on the one hand, and the House of Commons also knew it on the other. Had Charles been a real politician, an able tyrant, or an ambitious warrior, he would have proved far more mischievous, than he even did as a voluptuary, towards the best interests of these kingdoms. In that case, however, Osborne would have never risen above the Navy Board. The prelate of Sarum says, that ‘he was a positive undertaking man; so he gave the king great ease, by assuring him, all things would go according to his mind in the next session of parliament. And when his hopes failed him, he had always some excuse ready to put the miscarriage upon; by which means he got into the highest degree of confidence with the king, and maintained it the longest of any that ever served him.’ The speech of Lord Shaftesbury, on his coming into the Exchequer to be sworn in, still remains extant, containing some flattery,—some truth,—and some characteristics of his age. ‘Kings,’ says he, ‘are as Gods, and bestow honours, riches, and power, where they please; but in this they are men, that they can only choose, not make a person adequate to their employment.’ Persons generally hoped for some improvement, now that Buckingham was gone; since anything appeared better than the Cabal; even although the rumour should be a correct one, that Osborne had agreed to pay Lord Clifford some portion of his salary on resigning. Sir Thomas was ennobled in the following August, as Viscount Latimer. In June, 1674, he was created Earl of Danby.

Charles nevertheless had evidently elevated him too soon: for Arlington, Shaftesbury, and Lauderdale had not as yet withdrawn, although their combination was scattered and broken; nor had even Buckingham himself followed the example of Clifford in going altogether off the scene. Hence the guilty mantle of those wicked conspirators descended upon the new lord treasurer’s shoulders. His nomination openly announced him as participator in all the political crimes of his predecessors; more especially that hateful connection with France, which naturally and righteously soon drew upon him the jealousy and execration of the Commons. They refused the supplies, unless it should appear that Dutch obstinacy would render them absolutely necessary. This advance, in boldness of remonstrance, upon their conduct in the previous session may be accounted for, through the Duke of York having avowed himself a Roman Catholic. Lord Danby exerted his utmost efforts in secret to dispose his royal master to pacific designs. Shaftesbury had to surrender up the great seal. The remaining members of the

Cabal were soon furiously proceeded against. Louis the Fourteenth setting narrower limits to his liberality than could have been convenient to the British sovereign, the latter at length concluded an arrangement with Holland, through the Spanish ambassador, in February, 1674. Sir William Temple went forth once more to the Hague as our representative to the States ; flattering himself that he had left the court at home quite upon the right tack ; upon which our biographer, with all the simplicity in the world, enunciates the following sentences :

' Now that the test act was in force, peace made with the Dutch, and the connexion with France interrupted, there is nothing to object to in the policy of the administration of which Lord Danby was a member. It was equally consistent with his own, and with the public opinion. The treasury now gave relief, in what mode I am unable to say, to the sufferers, by the perfidious shutting up of the exchequer. The sum awarded is affirmed to have been £1,200,000. This was the commencement of a financial administration, which, although the subject of much controversy, most historians have lauded ; since under it, the revenue was augmented, while the expenses were diminished. In these departmental matters, Danby had probably his own way ; but he had by no means that dominant controul over the affairs of the King, which now belongs to a prime minister. Buckingham was finally cashiered in the spring of 1674 ; but Arlington remained, a mere cipher, until the 14th of the following September, when he resigned the secretaryship of state, and became lord chamberlain. He was by no means indisposed to a renewal of the connection with Louis, being very jealous of Danby, whom he envied for his easy acquisition of the white staff ; and not unwilling, as it is believed, to support his rivalry by the aid of a parliamentary opposition. The two discarded ministers, Shaftesbury and Buckingham, had now become flaming patriots.'—pp. 212, 213.

Such are the notions of this very amiable and moderate memorialist in palliating political misdemeanours. If the surface of matters can be only kept smooth and polished, conservatism remains perfectly satisfied : the jealousies of courtiers, and the fluctuations of the peerage, absorbing all that attention, which is far too sublime to analyze financial measures, or expatiate upon the genuine basement of the social pyramid. It always reminds us of the old chroniclers Froissart and Monstrelet ; who weep and wail over the fall of each individual knight and gentleman, throughout their battles, but dispose of the common soldiers as so many nothings, to be murdered by the dozen or score, as the case may be. We venture to conceive, that there were many things 'to object to in the policy of that administration of which Lord Danby was a member.' Besides which, it must be remembered, that he was ostensibly its leader ; and so long as he preferred continuing so, with the door of retreat at any moment open to him, he must be held responsible for the iniquity of ten thou-

sand abominations, of which he was cognisant, although taking in them no personal share. He was no Simon Pure amongst knaves and jugglers ; but himself the arch-conjuror, palming off upon the public his series of little base meannesses ; and endeavouring to aggrandize his own special fortunes with all his might and main. His caution, prudence, and apparent respectability, as compared with his predecessors, were the mere instincts of self-preservation. Through the operation of corruption, and cajolery he reigned and revelled ; until enemies more wicked, or perhaps more bold and clever than himself, plucked the stool from under him, and down he fell. He was grand master in an art, introduced from the state-craft of King James the First—that of turning to account the weapons and warfare of mercenary eloquence. An office—a sum of gold—an introduction to gilded circles—even allurements more directly immoral—produced changes, the reverse of alchemy. They hushed many an harangue—varied the side upon which many a vote was ultimately given—made hypocrisy in the two houses as common as hair powder—and frittered away the noblest germs of national prosperity. Mammon ruled the day, we had almost said, without a rival. Burnet tells us, that Danby bribed the less important members, instead of the leaders, which was not found to answer so well ; but as Hallam justly remarks, it rather seems probable that he was liberal to all ! The parliament itself gained the character and title of the pensioned parliament. The last cited author also observes, that ‘he had virtues, as an English minister, which serve to extenuate some great errors, and *an entire want of scrupulousness in his conduct!*’ Zealous against the church of Rome, and the aggrandizement of France, he counteracted, whilst he seemed to yield to the prepossessions of his sovereign ! Which eulogium strikes our plain understanding as being equivalent to portraying him as one of the greatest scoundrels then about court. Both whigs and tories seem at times scarcely out of the hornbook class in politics. No man, they may depend upon it, can ever be really and truly a great man without being a good man : nor can the wealthy or potent official, who has contrived to scatter every conscientious scruple to the winds of Heaven, carry ought else than a knave’s heart beneath his ermine, or under his coronet. We shall see this ere long sufficiently illustrated. Every bow he made the king, as well as every patriotic profession he uttered, was a feature in the grand farce of advancing himself at the cost of both crown and country. Until the people have their due share of power, royal ministers and privileged orders will be, like the sons of Zeruiah to David, too hard for liberalism. The comfort is that freedom is immortal ; whilst oppression engenders the

very worm at its root, which is, some day or other, to lay it prostrate in the dust.

Danby now turned his thoughts, through the national fear of Romanism, to some plan of comprehension, which should embrace nonconformity and episcopalianism in one common cause. Richard Baxter went so far as to put upon paper a proposal, that ecclesiastical teachers and schoolmasters should subscribe the doctrines and sacraments of the church of England, as expressed in the thirty-nine articles, according to the thirteenth of Queen Elizabeth : they were also to approve, in some general manner the homilies ; and set their hands to a declaration against rebellion and sedition. ‘ But,’ says our biographer, ‘ among the demands made by the nonconformists, some were such as no established church could reasonably be expected to admit. For the principle of the scheme was to leave the liturgy, sacraments, and other ordinances generally established, and in force ; but to allow of great latitude in omission, alteration, or nonconformity ; and this not only in private houses, but in the parish churches.’ No good resulted from these negotiations. All such plans indeed must, and ought to fail, wherever they involve any principle of a religious establishment. Episcopacy, swollen into prelacy, through receiving its crozier from the grant of an earthly sovereign, always deals with presbyterianism or congregationalism, on these occasions, as one possessing a *jure divino* claim to the largest slice—the lion’s portion—of the secular spoils, that are to be divided. When the lord treasurer, far too dull to discern the genuine nature of the difficulties before him, achieved no reward but disappointment for his pains, he resigned himself at once to a current of universal persecution, devised by Bishops Morley and Ward, who met their brethren of the right reverend bench at Lambeth. Other choice spirits there joined them—Lauderdale, Finch, Coventry, Williamson, and above all, the holder of the white staff. The consequence of their consultation soon appeared, in the shape of an order in council, forbidding attendance at mass, reviving the old catholic disabilities, and penalties ; and requiring a rigorous enforcement of the laws against conventicles. St. Paul’s, moreover, was to be rebuilt, with respect to which Lord Danby professed ardent zeal ; openly accusing those before him in power for having neglected it so long. Still further to conciliate the almost forgotten royalists, he erected at Charing Cross that fine equestrian statue of Charles the First, which had lain for years in concealment ; but which few can even now examine without admiration at its merits, as a specimen of art. Parliament soon afterwards reassembled for its thirteenth session, after an interval of fourteen months. The son and successor of the royal martyr forth-

with illustrated that profundity of cunning which we may allow him to have inherited from his father. He boasted in his speech of what he had done to extinguish the fears and jealousies of popery ; he being a disguised papist himself at that very moment ! More courteously than usual of late years, he requested the loyal assistance of his subjects, to extricate his exchequer from embarrassment, by granting abundant supplies. It was neither more nor less, however, than the wolf requesting the crane to take the bone out of his throat : and who would trust their necks within such perilous jaws ? Lord Russell, with Cavendish and his friends, immediately directed their blows at the new minister. ‘ All we give,’ they exclaimed, ‘ is too little, when the treasury is managed to set up private men, and their heirs. The Earl of Danby has acted in a high and arbitrary manner, having disposed of the monies as he pleased : for he has publicly declared amongst his servants, that a new proclamation is better than an old law.’ His dismissal from all employment was therefore moved, and quickly supported by an impeachment of seven articles. Trick, subterfuge, and deep bribery, for the present, dispersed the tempest ; but already was that seed germinating, which afterwards produced the revolution. Middle classes began once more to gather together the scattered elements of an energy which had sympathized with Eliot, or supported Pym and Hampden. Defeated in their attempts to ruin Lord Danby by personal accusation, the leaders of opposition resorted to the more ordinary course of impugning the measures of his government. ‘ He had established, and sincerely endeavoured to maintain, the neutrality of England between France and Holland. But a body of English troops still remained in the service of the King of France, and it was the joint object of the Dutch and Spanish ministers, and of the English opposition, to procure the return of these troops.’ The house of Commons, in April and May, 1675, addressed Charles to recall them, and prevent any more from going. He promised the latter, but refused the former, as inconsistent with his honour ! So abused was this sacred term to the worst purposes.

It may well be demanded, what these wicked men, both sovereign and cabinet, had really to do with honour at all ? Danby now introduced into that hotbed of bigotry and oppression, the House of Lords, a measure, which even his biographer admits, must be accounted the most remarkable of his administration. His brother-in-law, Lord Lindsay, had to officiate as mouth-piece on this occasion, of that principle in politics, which, having horns like a lamb, in the end thunders like a dragon. Passive obedience carries under the veil of meekness, a heart athirst for the murder of patriotism. So it was then, and so

must it be, until the close of time ; whether an archbishop Laud wishes to support a Strafford ; or his successors, the Puseyites of our own day, would fain prostrate liberty once more under their two swords—the civil and the ecclesiastical. We are of course alluding to the celebrated Non-resisting-test ; which, although some have supposed not to have been the genuine offspring of the Lord Treasurer, as to its conception, most certainly became his, by subsequent adoption. It stood, indeed, upon the floor of the upper chamber, in such deformity and ugliness, that to claim too near a relationship, until the public mind had grown accustomed to the *prodigium horridum*, might have seemed rather perilous to the boldest statesman. All persons in council, office, parliament, or the magistracy, were to declare, upon their oaths, as follows :—‘I do avow, protest, and declare, that it is not lawful upon any pretext whatsoever to take up arms against his Majesty, and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking up arms, by his authority, against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him, in pursuance of such commission. And I do swear, that I will not at any time endeavour the alteration of the government either in church or state.’ Lingard mentions some alterations afterwards made in it. But John Locke watched the court, and foresaw that it would presently work its own undoing. The debates lasted for sixteen days. Shaftesbury rested his counter-arguments ‘upon general objections, and particularly upon speculative difficulties, which might, under various contingencies, be occasioned by the inaction of the test.’ The whole bill, Hallam thinks, was propounded as a stone of contention and stumbling amongst the country party ; in which presbyterians and parliamentarians were associated with certain disappointed cavaliers. However this might be, it never went beyond the House of Peers ; the question of privilege having been purposely started, about Doctor Shirley, and Sir John Fagg, which occasioned successive prorogations. In the contest thus raised, between their lordships and the commons, as to whether the peerage constituted a supreme court of judicature, Charles and his supple minister preached up moderation, and urged on the wheels of an irresponsible yet necessitous government, as well as they could. No parliamentary session for business seems to have occurred until February, 1677. During the long interval, his majesty once more degraded himself into a base pensioner of Louis. He condescended to receive half a million of crowns, for postponing the grand council of these nations for fifteen months. In the beginning of the year 1676, the two sovereigns bound themselves by a formal treaty, of which Danby was without doubt cognizant, not to enter upon any engagements, but by mutual consent ; and the Stuart promised,

for a pecuniary consideration, not to call the two houses together, or at least to prorogue and dissolve them, should any patriotic attempts be made to impose anti-gallican arrangements. Our William the Third, through Rouvigny, came afterwards to a knowledge of this traitorous and treacherous compact ; on the strength of which, although Lord Danby had advised his master not to execute it, *he nevertheless pressed the French cabinet for the wages* ; and no less than £200,000 sterling was actually paid ! No wonder that the representatives of the people did their utmost to keep back every supply, within their reach, from such an exchequer !

Upon the clearest perceptions that neither the king nor his white staff could be trusted, even so far back as October, 1675, they had resolved that no sums should be voted for taking off anticipations from the revenue. Our pliant biographer blames them for this ; since the executive could scarcely have urged any request more moderate in its character or appearance. Yet supposing they had acceded to the royal solicitations—would their grants have been ultimately anything more than just so much waste of the national property ? The notorious Chiffinch, as pander to the pleasures of a wicked monarch, was ready to absorb every shilling he could lay hold of, for purposes too scandalous to sully these pages with in any length of detail. All the bounty of Louis the Fourteenth seemed insufficient to satiate and feed this filthy and abominable sponge ! Was the House of Commons to manifest any particular regard for the employer of such a profligate ? Instead of giving new supplies for the navy, they appropriated the customs to that service : and though they voted money for building ships, it was by a mere minute majority, that a proposition was negatived for placing the amount to be raised under the custody of the city of London. Meanwhile, Lord Danby ceased not to labour in his vocation. With wretched tools, with an extravagant prince, amidst the multifarious mismanagement inherited from his predecessors in office, he really wrought wonders. Pensions alone swallowed up £145,000 per annum, out of an income, which could not ordinarily be reckoned at more than from £1,200,000, to £1,360,000. Through curious and contemporaneous testimony, we gather, that the entire legal revenues, from 1673 to 1679, returned about £8,200,000, or £1,366,000 a year : besides which, it may be said, there were the disgraceful French subsidies ; and the extraordinary supplies granted at different times ; so as that for the entire twenty-four years of Charles the Second's reign, these last actually amounted to £11,443,407, or about £476,808 per annum, taking an average. Allowing, however, in the gross, £1,800,000 as the royal annual receipts, the disbursements, on

the other hand, were generally £1,387,770 ; and always £1,200,000 ;—besides the contingencies and extraordinaries of two Dutch wars ; the preparations for a French one, in 1678 ; the interest at six per cent. paid upon the £1,200,000 compensation to the sufferers from closing the exchequer ; and the refitment of the navy. The anticipations came to as much as £866,000, which may perhaps be considered as the germ of our national debt, now multiplied from thousands to millions. The earl may very likely have done his best amidst such pecuniary discouragements and perplexities ; whilst we cannot refrain from smiling, at the almost obstinate reluctance, with which Mr. Courtenay admits irrefragable evidence against the integrity of his hero. It becomes thoroughly resistless, as he proceeds ; until we are finally favoured with the following :—

‘ At last thwarted, and *wrongfully suspected* by parliament, Danby, notwithstanding his predilections against the French interests, did become a party, *unwilling, and indeed scarcely consenting*, to one of Charles’s arrangements with the French court, *founded upon the policy which he entirely disapproved*. Although there is no reason to doubt, but that the stipulations of this treaty were sold to France for a renewal of Charles’s pension, I cannot concur with those, who are of opinion that Danby’s participation in these corrupt bargains commenced during the recess of 1676. I see no reason for doubting his own statement, which fixes, after the prorogation in April, 1677, ‘the first time of his knowing any transaction about French money.’ Nevertheless, the stipulations, of which *he was undoubtedly conversant, were such as cannot be defended*, in regard either to the policy of England, or the principles and professions of the minister.’’—pp. 237, 8.

In these lines the italics are ours ; and we have used them to demonstrate the extraordinary bias which will affect conservative minds, when contemplating certain transgressions perpetrated in their own school of policy. The testimony against the lord treasurer having ever been a personage of common integrity is conclusive from the very commencement ; yet we have him portrayed in the light very much of a persecuted statesman ! As to the account given by Lord John Russell of his virtuous ancestor, our biographer has the glance of a basilisk, and detects the slightest disposition even towards the commission of an error in judgment. But here, in the case of Lord Danby, a convicted political sinner of many a session, a man who had sworn and forsworn himself until his oaths of official uprightness must have attenuated into mere cobwebs to his conscience,—we meet with a marvellously different mode of treatment. This guilty individual has been ‘*wrongfully suspected* ;’—he has been at length convicted of being a party to national treason, yet his

mind is mentioned as having been ‘unwilling,’ and indeed scarcely ‘consenting;’—his own statement is admitted, as to when his criminality really began, as if every rogue at the Old Bailey is not just as plausible in narrowing the limits of his delinquency;—his earlier obliquities are glossed over, or leniently softened down at a somewhat later period, into ‘stipulations which cannot be defended;’ and yet this selfsame writer can call such a philosopher, as the author of the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, to account, because in ‘his long and spirited narration of what passed about the non-resisting test, the party feeling is too strong to admit of justice being done to the reasons and arguments of the court and its retainers.’ The opposition looked at Lord Danby and his conduct, standing closer to both than we do; and, therefore, of course not able to see the proportions of good and evil in his character, either with that clearness or calmness, which posterity alone can manifest. They daily more and more distrusted him, and had most satisfactory grounds for doing so. All his professions and assurances of zeal against France went for little or nothing. The five-and-twenty thousand troops, of as splendid soldiers as the world ever saw, raised suddenly in 1677, under pretexts that the counsels of Louis must at length be resisted, excited the worst apprehensions. We now know, from the correspondence of Barillon in Dalrymple, that Charles and his brother looked to them as useful means for consolidating the royal authority. England meanwhile prospered at home through her general tranquillity and commercial enterprise: but these very circumstances made such as doubted the lawfulness of standing armies at all, the more fearful lest the blessings of secular opulence, dependant as they must ever be upon liberty, should be placed in jeopardy. Danby was endeavouring to repress the free discussion of political topics. An old proclamation was re-issued for the extinction of coffee-houses, because there the tongues of men presumed to canvass the tyranny of government. He attempted at the same time to tamper with the Irish revenues, by farming them out upon that plan of competition, which would produce for himself the greatest advantage. Burnet informs us how ‘this secret broke out;’ and Lord Widdrington confessed that he made an offer of a round sum to the lord treasurer, with respect to which Halifax observed, that ‘it was declined so *very mildly*,’ as not to discourage further advances. Ecclesiastical appointments also quickened apprehensions in some quarters. Sancroft was nominated to succeed Sheldon, as archbishop of Canterbury; from whose peculiar principles, the puritans, remembering Laud, began to fear for their ears. When parliament met in February 1677, large ministerial majorities soon demonstrated that matters were to be

carried with a high hand. Buckingham, Salisbury, Shaftesbury, and Wharton, were committed to the Tower for impugning the legality of the Houses meeting without a dissolution, since the prorogation had extended beyond a year. Bribery, then as now, was in the mouth of everybody; and upon the solemn assurances of Courtin, who had succeeded Rouvigny, we ascertain that 'when the king received in January a portion of his annual pension from France, the whole sum was immediately devoted to the purchase of votes in the House of Commons.' In other words, Lord Danby measured and estimated others by his own long arm and itching palm. He thought, and justly thought, that it was only to pay and have!

In this session not only were supplies tardily and scantily given, but the courage of the Commons began to rise against the notorious malversations of the crown. For ships, £584,000, although voted, had to be administered under an order of appropriation, directing that an account of the expenditure should be rendered to the house. His majesty moreover was sorely pressed, upon his foreign affairs. France, Austria, and Spain, were now vying with each other, who should purchase the most effectual interest amongst our British legislators! Who can peruse these pages of our annals without blushing for very shame? Even Russell, Hollis, and the patriots, looked abroad for succour; and some defiled their hitherto fair and spotless names with the contamination of foreign gold. We can tolerate no excuse for their crimes. The views of the two noblemen just named, in their clandestine intercourse with the French ambassador, may have appeared satisfactory to themselves, namely, to detach Louis from Charles,—to countermine the intrigues of their wicked parasites,—to crush the Duke of York and his popish faction,—to procure the disbanding of a dangerous army,—the dissolution of a corrupted parliament,—the dismissal of a bad minister. All this, we admit, may have been true; but it was the policy of less honourable politicians than their great prototypes of the commonwealth: it was whiggery rather than liberalism; it was the expediency, rather than the genuine wisdom of patriotism, sporting with public honesty and individual selfishness, on the very edge of a most perilous precipice. There can be no allowed compromise between right and wrong in first-rate minds. Lord Danby, meanwhile, imitated the merest dabbler in polities, through his introducing measure after measure, to catch votes and good opinions, were that possible, from opposite sections in the senate. Most of these were little else than paper kites, which, soared into the clouds for their appointed hour or purpose, and then fell to the ground abandoned or forgotten. His correspondence with Paris and the Hague thickened rapidly in complexity and in-

rest. He wished to please his sovereign, keep his place, govern the realm, aggrandize the church of England, check nonconformity and popery, flatter Louis, get his money, cheat him out of the fulfilment of every promise ever made or offered by Charles, and gratify the Prince of Orange. How tangled and strange appears the whole skein of affairs under the management of such a pretender! For the last three years he had cultivated the most amicable intercourse with William, upon the sagacious system of having two strings to his bow. Through Lady Temple, in May 1677, his highness confidentially transmitted a wish to the lord treasurer, that he might be permitted to court the princess Mary. This had been first suggested in 1675, when, after a reluctant consent had been extorted by the king from his brother, the offer was made by Lords Arlington and Ossory to the Prince of Orange, who then received it coolly. Affairs, however, had now altered, and Danby, to his credit, espoused the match warmly. He obtained in September an express invitation for the royal suitor to come over to England. His influence removed a number of difficulties, started in succession, both by his majesty and the Duke of York, who proposed that the marriage should be deferred until after the conclusion of peace. Happily it took place on the 4th of November, leading as it did eleven years afterwards to most important consequences. Louis the Fourteenth, who had pledged himself to pay Charles 2,000,000 livres for proroguing parliament from December to April 1678, fired at the intelligence of this auspicious union, and stopped his subsidies. Miserable chaffering and deception now ensued. Hostilities were menaced against France to secure proper terms with regard to the Netherlands. Votes of supply nevertheless passed with extreme difficulty, from the prevalence of distrust amongst all parties. Clarges made a motion and carried it, that no monies should be really appropriated, until his majesty should have satisfied the opposition with regard to religion; which so exasperated the king, that Barillon being on the spot ready to renew any pecuniary arrangements, that might buy over so profligate a potentate, he at once fell in with them, got upon his old tack of succumbing to the Grand Monarque for money, and compelled the conclusion of a treaty at Nimeguen in the autumn of that year, 1678. The lord treasurer, throughout these atrocious negotiations, bemired himself more and more deeply in political abominations. Thus, at the command of Charles, he wrote to Montague at Paris in March, as follows:—
‘In case the conditions of peace shall be accepted, the king expects to have six millions of livres a year for three years, from the time that this agreement shall be signed between his majesty and the king of France, because it will probably be two or three

years before the parliament will be in a humour to give him any supplies, after the making of any peace with France ; and the ambassador here has always agreed for that sum, though not for so long a time.' But Lord Danby, recently adorned with the Garter, the price probably of his compliances in these unconstitutional particulars, was thus working out his own overthrow. In attempting to overreach all parties he had displeased all. The popish plot also drew him into the labyrinth of its mysterious mazes. He is reported to have said on seeing Titus Oates, 'There goes one of the saviours of England, but I hope to see him hanged within a month.' That brief term, however, laid trains of intrigues with consequences far differing from the treasurer's anticipations. The exclusion of catholics from office added, indeed, another leaf to his laurels won in the way of passing test acts ; but he opposed the militia bill, and started fresh measures for strengthening the prerogative, and rendering the crown finances more or less beyond the reach of being interfered with by the lower house. Yet he had touched the zenith of his premiership, and was about to be eclipsed in the political hemisphere.

Ralph Montague, to whom he had addressed that fatal communication, in March 1678, now happened to be aspiring after the office of Secretary of State, to which Danby in preference nominated his old acquaintance Sir William Temple. The disappointed agent, hateful even to the harlots and hangers-on of his royal employer, left Paris in dudgeon, obtained a seat in parliament for Northampton, boasted to Barillon that he could now ruin the lord treasurer, and that for 100,000 crowns as a gratuity to himself, as well as 100,000 livres to bribe a sufficient number of senatorial colleagues into the scheme, he would undertake to do it. Montague, it should be known, had been one of the tempters used by Charles and Louis towards Danby, to allure him into his most crooked courses : and, therefore, that he should thus turn upon him through spitefulness, mortification, and a thirst for vengeance, marvellously illustrates the times. Cabinets were then dens of thieves, often without a vestige even of that specious and probably exaggerated honour, which has occasionally been discovered amongst highwaymen. This paragon of ambassadors went to work in his project with the subterranean industry of a mole. Danby having been informed of his intentions, as also that he had intrigued with the papal nuncio at Paris, endeavoured to be beforehand with him on this ground, and ordered his papers to be seized by royal authority, acquainting the House of Commons that the interests of protestantism lay concerned in so stringent a process. Montague, in no respect daunted, rose up forthwith in his place, and stated his be-

lief that the real object in seizing his papers was to obtain possession of some letters ‘of consequence, which he had to produce about the designs of a great minister !’ Several members were then despatched for a particular box which he pointed out. The key had been already seized, although not applied ; but the house commanding that the lock should be broken, Montague immediately presented the ill-fated letter from the lord treasurer, from which we have given an extract ; and on the strength of which the Commons resolved, by a majority of 179 against 116, to impeach the delinquent without further delay. The earl then sent down two papers from Montague, explaining the intrigues of Louis with William lord Russell and other leaders of the opposition ! These were read after their delivery by the Speaker, but no further notice appears to have been taken of them. Danby was charged upon six different articles : that he had traitorously encroached on legal authority by treating with foreign powers unknown to the council ; that he had aimed at introducing arbitrary government ; that he had impeded the assemblage of parliament for French money : that he was popishly affected, being no friend to the discoverers of the late horrid plot ; that he had wasted public treasure in pensions and secret services to the extent of £231,602 in two years ; and that after diverting one branch of revenue to private uses, he had obtained sundry considerable grants from the crown property to himself. He admitted that his service had been profitable to him, but averred that in six years he had not, as high treasurer, got half of what others had gained in inferior situations. Charles, however, at length dissolved this second long parliament, and summoned a fresh one. Seymour, on being re-elected speaker, was refused approval on the part of the king, there having been a quarrel between this gentleman and the earl, or, as some say, his countess. The Commons, on a respectful remonstrance, were replied to by Charles, ‘Gentlemen,—all this is but loss of time, and, therefore, I command you to go back to your house, and do as I have directed you !’ A compromise was ultimately effected as to the point of form : but where men hated Danby before, they despised him now. Attacks on him were renewed instantly. Even resignation only whetted their fury. The patriots moved his majesty for a committal ; but Charles told them he had given his lordship, of his own accord, a pardon under the great seal ; acknowledging manfully enough, that the obnoxious communications upon which his impeachment had been founded, were written by his own order. A bill of attainder then passed, to which he surrendered for his trial, but pleaded his pardon. A whirlwind of legal argumentation followed, silenced at last by a second dissolution, which left the culprit straitly shut up in

the tower, crestfallen, browbeaten, and so reduced as then, for almost the first time *not to be hated*: but only as Algernon Sidney wrote at the moment—‘Never was a man less pitied than he!’ He remained prisoner from April 1679 to February 1683, when he was bailed by Judge Jeffries—himself in £20,000, and four of his noble friends being also bound in £5,000 a piece, on his behalf. Charles the Second received him kindly on his enlargement, but as a statesman he took no further part in public affairs, until tories, as well as whigs, were turning their attention to the Prince of Orange. In short, a revolution had now become necessary, and so practised a placeman could hardly remain an idle spectator.

William had sent over his most confidential agent, Mr. Dyckveldt, to sound the troubled waters; and amongst others, he was to confer with Lord Danby. The latter wrote his highness a long letter in reply, committing himself as little as possible, but opening the gate very gradually for further communications. In another letter, bearing date the 27th of March, 1688, his lordship affords the first hint of suspicions, which soon became general amongst the protestants, that a supposititious heir was about to be imposed upon these kingdoms. Whether Danby entertained such apprehensions sincerely or not, seems difficult to determine. The queen was confined on the 10th of June; and, exactly three weeks afterwards, on the day of the acquittal of the bishops, he was one of the seven who signed the famous invitation. The proposer of the Non-resisting Test, as his memorialist rightly observes, was clearly convicted of gross inconsistency by his subscription to this paper; which breathes nothing, from beginning to end, but the use of forcible means for effecting certain changes in the government. The tory Lord Danby, then met the whig Lord Devonshire, at Whittington in Derbyshire; after which another conference between the same noblemen took place in Yorkshire, about the commencement of October. James now summoned him to London, since he had tendered ‘offers of service,’ without, however, the slightest intention of fulfilling them. We differ from Mr. Courtenay *toto cælo*, with regard to the lawfulness of such dissimulation; for meanwhile he had become actively zealous in the service of the rising sun. An aristocracy may venture to dispense with strict moral obligations: but the penalties of eternal justice will nevertheless be enacted from it in the long run. When William was advancing from Exeter towards Salisbury, Danby put himself at the head of a hundred horse, intimidated four troops of mounted militia to join them, and secured York for the revolution. The lords Lumley, Fairfax, and Willoughby, quickly attached themselves to the snowball; although it rolled onward with some trepidation, and

might often have dissolved, had not their tory leader reminded his retainers, that they were already up to their chins in treason ; that the king was a monstrous coward ; and, therefore, that it was only by continuing to advance, that they could hope to save their necks, or keep their heads upon their shoulders :—

' But he had recourse to artifice for keeping them in the right course. He intercepted all letters, and produced those only, which answered his purpose : and, when news came, which he could not intercept, that the king would pardon all that deserted from the prince, he caused a fabricated letter to be brought to him by express, just as he was sitting down to dinner with his friends ;—It was only a letter he said, from Lord ——, and might be read at leisure. After dinner he drew the letter from under his plate and read it :—his correspondent assured him as a secret worth knowing, that the king, as soon as he could cause a disunion among them, was resolved to hang up all whom he could get into his hands. At another time, he intercepted a letter from one of the king's friends in Yorkshire, acquainting his majesty, that the adherents of the prince in those parts amounted to about 4,000 men. Those, to whom he shewed this letter, proposed that it should be stopped ; but their artful chief added a cypher to the number, and thus sent to the king authentic information, that 40,000 men of Yorkshire had risen against him. Lord Danby, and his companions, became masters of Hull, Newcastle, and Berwick. Yet, decisive as these measures were, amounting beyond all doubt to high treason against the king, Danby did not join the prince, nor repair to London ;—where he did not arrive in obedience to the repeated messages of William, until the evening of the 26th of December, the day after the meeting of peers, when they invited his highness to take upon him the administration of affairs, until a parliament should assemble.'—p. 325, 6.

In plain language he was doing his utmost to enhance the value of his services ; and thus raise their price in this new political market. Should he obtain the white staff a second time,—which he totally failed in doing,—it was not his intention to share its emoluments with any one else ; supposing it to be true, that he had ever done so before, with Lord Clifford of Chudleigh. The vaunted convention now met, and its consequences are too well known to need recapitulation in these pages. Our admiration of what then occurred is not enthusiastically fervent ; our impression being, that the events of 1688-9, fastened upon us the yoke of an oligarchy ; a bondage in itself so disastrous and galling, that Great Britain must have long ago shaken it off, had not just such a modicum of good been achieved, as induced her, for the sake of peace, to remain satisfied with about one quarter instead of the mighty whole, which she ought to have. Since that time also, our government has seemed to us, neither more nor less than an enormous fraud. Freedom and genuine patriotism have been cheated into acting a part in the constitutional

farce : so that the rights of conscience, equality before the law, equity in taxation, representation of the people, have all dwindled into delusive shadows,—scarcely worth the fighting for. Toryism, feudalism, and even whiggery,—by which last we mean half-heartedness in the love of liberty,—had all far too much to do with enthroning King William, not to leaven the entire lump of quackery, with their own peculiar iniquities. Lord Danby had the interests of his country about as much at heart, as selfishness ever has,—when employed in lining its nest with stolen feathers, or cooking its provisions with purloined fuel. Roguery, treachery, despotism, oppression, and prelacy, have ridden by turns on the back of the revolution ! *Dum delirantur reges plectuntur Achivi !* Such are our honest and deliberate opinions. Lord Danby wanted Mary, at one moment, to have received the crown alone : but, when driven by circumstances to the wall, through feeling that the courage of a man grew necessary for the crisis, he acquiesced in the vote of vacancy, trusting that the successor to James would not last many years. The presidentship of the council was his reward ; besides an advancement in the peerage,—being made Marquis of Carmarthen. His old rival Halifax, having drawn a more lucrative prize in the lottery, helped to depress him. He, and his fellow harpies, however, quickly set on foot their infamous intrigues with the exiled family. He contrived also to get himself considered the champion of the high-church party ; after coalescing more closely every day with bishop Compton, and the clergy. But no longer could he enjoy his pastime as the sole ruler of affairs. Attempts were even ventured to revive the impeachment ; but they dropped one after the other into oblivion.

His name will nevertheless always remain connected with certain important discussions ; such as whether the House of Lords can refuse to commit upon a charge of treason sent up by the House of Commons ; that a pardon from the crown can be no longer pleaded in bar for sheltering a guilty minister ; and that dissolutions do not terminate impeachments. When Halifax and Shrewsbury had withdrawn from administration, Lord Carmarthen aimed at something like a revival of his former activity, and his wonted greediness. Mary appears to have little liked him. She complains to her husband, then absent in Ireland, about his being ‘mighty hot’ in the appointment of Russell as naval commander ; as also at his wanting £8,000 for his daughter, Lady Plymouth—that sum, in the poverty of the exchequer, being thought ‘too great to be spared.’ Subsequently he worried the King with complaints of his colleagues ; and they of him, as ‘being very peevish.’ The Dukedom of Leeds was conferred upon him in 1694 ; after which, in the ensuing session, he ad-

vised his royal master to consent to the triennial bill. Yet another impeachment remained in store for him, through his having received £5,000 from the East India Company, for his influence in passing the charter for a renewal of their privileges. Burnet says, that the proceedings were hushed up, because too many great people, perhaps on both sides, were implicated in these corrupt practices. At the close of 1697, the civil list was granted to William the Third for life ; a measure quite conformable to the monarchical and arbitrary principles of his Grace. For two years more he therefore clung to office, although for a long period Shrewsbury had been re-appointed as one of the secretaries of state. Both finally retired in May, 1699. On the accession of Queen Anne, he was sworn of her privy council; and in 1703 concurred with Marlborough, Godolphin, and others, in supporting without success an act for preventing occasional conformity. In 1705, we find him resisting the attempt to bring over to England the heir presumptive to the throne ; and croaking in the most approved style of conservatism against the dangers of the established church. The celebrated trial of Sacheverel produced him for the last time upon the public stage, and that, too, for no less a purpose than to condemn the revolution of 1688 ! It had failed to answer his expectations, or, in other and simpler phraseology, he had not got enough by it. Even to the elector of Hanover, in the teeth of his disavowal of any but hereditary right, he could express his devoted attachment. He published his collection of letters in 1710 ; after which nothing further is heard of him, than that he continued his attendance in the House of Lords to the end of the session in 1712. In that summer, on the 26th of July, at Easton, a seat of Lord Pomfret, in Northamptonshire, he expired in the eighty-first year of his age : about as much missed, it would seem, from the page of history, as though her Majesty had extinguished one of her wax candles in the royal drawing room !

His amiable biographer, regretting that there are no particulars extant of his dissolution, dismisses him with these neutral characteristics : ‘ He certainly was not a public scoffer ; or distinguished in the profligate age in which he lived, for gross immorality. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we may assume that he believed in the doctrines of the church, of which he was the zealous and constant advocate ; nor do we see reason to believe that he, in his practice, deviated more or less than men of the world in general from the duties of morality. He was a man of unpopular manners. Of such men, the good qualities are depreciated, and the faults exaggerated. From the false position in which he was placed, as a statesman, during the most prominent part of his history, he is the idol of no section

of political writers: *in his principal views he was sound and consistent*; in his practice, as a minister, weak and wavering.' Alas, for conservatism in Mr. Courtenay; and for whiggery in Mr. Hallam, who conceives that his 'corrupt policy, although highly culpable, was not unprecedented; it was even conformable to the court standard of duty; he was rather a minister to be pulled down than a man to be severely punished: his one great and undeniable service, to the protestant and English interests, should have palliated a multitude of errors:' as if this happy accident had originated from any intrinsic virtue, ability, foresight, or disinterestedness. Neither do we wish to be unreasonably harsh or severe. The plan of this article has been, as far as possible, to let facts speak for themselves. The statesmen of those times undoubtedly were among the worst of mankind. We never revert to their annals without shuddering at the depravity of our species, both male and female. We seem to fancy ourselves thrown upon a continent which has but just emerged, say for about a generation, from some deluge of immorality and uncleanness. There is a sliminess and rankness belonging to the entire retrospect. All the reptiles are large and monstrous. The fowls of prey are on a tremendous scale—fearful in their flight, and filthy in their feeding and habits. But of the more generous savages—such as lions, elephants, or useful domestic quadrupeds, there are few or none. Society in its highest and noblest forms, based upon religion, cemented by ties of affection or sympathy, and producing mutual advantages, presents the eye with no vestiges of its existence. Potent Nimrods for ever cross the scene in the cruel act of hunting either the souls or bodies of men; like Orion in the shadowy Hades of the Odyssey,

Θηρας ομοις ειλεῦντα κατ' ασφοδελον λειμῶνα
Τους αυτος κατεπεφνεν εν οιωπολοισιν ορεσσι,
Χερσιν εχων ροπαλον, παγχαλκεον, αινεν 'ααγες !

There appears no love—no holiness—no quietness—no sweets of companionship. Of course all this must be understood with innumerable limitations, since we speak only of the general surface of historical description. Yet Sir Thomas Osborne, Viscount Latimer, Earl of Danby, Marquis of Carmarthen, Duke of Leeds, never seems to have possessed a single friend. The worthies of the former half of the seventeenth century tarried not long enough to do more than sow the seeds of principles, which, after lying in the soil of the middle and lower classes for ages, have their harvest as yet to come. The restoration drove such numbers from our shores of those who were the salt of the earth; and at the same time so corrupted the total atmosphere of society and government, that the Andrew Marvels of that period wandered

up and down in despair, adopting even the language of the poet too often in vain :

Diluvio ex illo tot vasta per æquora vecti
Dis sedem exiguum patriis litusque rogamus
Innocuum, et cunctis undamque auramque patentem !

If Danby must be judged by the day in which he flourished, we can only admit that he was worthy of it. All we ask in conclusion is, that the school and system in which he numbers almost exclusively his admirers, may never permanently succeed in establishing an influence over us : we mean, from this time forward. His order, the aristocracy, have governed these realms long enough ; we believe from 1690 to 1830. Will the House of Lords now look forward to a renewed lease of their power, under the auspices of Sir Robert Peel ? We imagine not : *haud facile libertas et DOMINI miscentur !* We rather conceive that there is an hour rapidly approaching, when all the mummeries of religious establishments—all the oppressive privileges and prejudices of feudalism—all the hereditary legislation which has ground down our masses, and encumbered us with the largest national debt in Europe—will be buried in one sepulchre, amidst the universal triumphs of an emancipated world !

Art. II. *Endeavours after the Christian Life.* A volume of Discourses.
By James Martineau. pp. 347. London: J. Green, Newgate-street.

THESE discourses, as the title imports, are practical and not controversial. Without any connexion with each other, and often without any with their texts, they treat upon various points of sentiment and duty more or less important in themselves, and in their relation to the general subject. Our readers will expect to find in them great indications of mental force and beauty. Nor will they be disappointed. They are the production of a subtle and imaginative mind. What Robert Hall said of himself, Mr. Martineau cannot say—that he never has an image but when he wants one. The just description of his style would be, not that it abounds with figures, but that it is altogether figurative. He thinks in symbols. The wonder is, that so acute and logical a mind should not keep a more severe control over its fancy, and write a book of poetry for a volume of discourses. The style is sometimes in sympathy rather with a sickly sentimentality, than with the views of life and duty, which he cherishes and teaches. We would, with all

respect, suggest to him the wisdom of infusing greater vigour and manliness into it, as none knows how, when he chooses, to clothe a sentiment with greater strength, or join to it a sharper point—and to assign to his imagination the office of providing the occasional adornment, and not the habitual vesture, of his thoughts. A little more of general severity will not make his tenderness less soft and sweet. Tears and flowers may tire.

The Christian life. It is a glorious subject. ‘Endeavours’ after it are the highest and worthiest of all endeavours. It is the end of all human life, of all divine religion. In nothing else do the powers and passions of the soul find full development, and exercise, and rest. We are not men till we are Christians. And what but this embodies the conception and design of religious things—of truth—of institutions—of providence? This is the building to which they are the scaffolding; the kernel, of which they are the shell; the spirit, of which they are the body. We love this subject, for its own sake. But its selection by Mr. Martineau gives it an additional interest to us of a peculiar kind. We would not conceal the fact, that we value the book spiritually, chiefly as an indication. It is not the character of the discourses, but the creed of their author that makes us notice it. To see such a work from such a quarter is something fresh. Unitarianism has been for the most part anxious to pull down rather than build up. This has arisen perhaps as much from its circumstances as its spirit, its relation to other systems as the nature of its own. Being, in heresy, a very ‘Hebrew of the Hebrews’—the ‘straitest sect’ of schism, if schism meant what it is commonly, but foolishly, supposed to mean—‘the dissidence of dissent, and the protestantism of the protestant religion’—it has had to do fierce battle both for external security and from internal conviction; its attention has been thus diverted too much from the spiritual functions of all systems. With one hand it has ‘held the weapon,’ but not always with the other ‘wrought in the work.’ It has been more concerned about the form and materials of the temple than the shekinah, even its own shekinah, *if it have a glory*. But the scene is being changed. An evident impression prevails among some of its disciples, as elsewhere, that it is a poor thing to destroy alone, even if it be error that is destroyed, but a glorious thing to create and cherish—the one ‘hath no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth.’ This feeling may be incidentally helped by the little success of the destructive agency hitherto employed. Nor is this disparagement. We are always learning from experience, and one way in which we learn is, that the failure of our plans leads us to question our policy. The difficulty of

success suggests the inquiry—Why seek it? *Cui bono?* But we do not ascribe to this cause any power or place that would exclude the operation of better principles. It is certain that men of nearly all systems are thirsting for more spiritualism. The most technical, and the least technical—the most orthodox, and the least orthodox—the most superstitious, and the most sceptical—are asking for something deeper, stronger, of more ethereal and warmer life than they have known. It is the origin of new classes—it is the wonderful transformation of old ones. It leads to division in some directions, to union in others, for the principle of fellowship is being changed, and old bonds will not suffice for the young spirit—the new wine must have new bottles. Hence men of Mr. Martineau's school are getting to care less for literal modes, and more for living power. They are assaying to clothe their skeleton with flesh, and to breathe into it a breath of life. We can imagine the wonder and dismay with which a Belsham or a Priestley would contemplate, in visiting the earth afresh, the system which they left, as it is now held and worked by some of their better scholars; the mixture of consternation and indignation with which they would gaze into the sepulchre where they had deposited their still faith, at 'not finding there the *body*.' They would have to read the pregnant history of time since their departure, before they could comprehend the 'signs' of the time now present. It is impossible to contemplate this position of unitarianism, at least as far as some of its abettors are concerned, without interest. It is good in itself, it is better in its promise. We confess we have more hope of unitarians from their own aspirations, than we have from doctrinal discussions. The views of the intellect and the moral conditions of the heart act and react upon each other—but it is a more effectual as well as nobler thing for the soul to require, than for the understanding to be schooled into, a scriptural faith. Who would not prefer an extension of the body which is the natural effect of growth, to that brought about upon the bed of a Procrustes? Aspirations after anything like the Christian life will not remain long apart from something like the Christian truth.

It has been already intimated, that the discourses now before us do not consist of any *systematic* representation of the elements, or efforts for the promotion, of the Christian life. 'No formal connexion,' observes the author, 'will be found among the several discourses in this volume. Prepared at different times, and in different moods of meditation, they are related to each other only by their common relation to the great ends of responsible existence. The title, indeed, expresses the spirit, rather than the matter, of the book ;—which

'endeavours' to produce, rather than describe, the essential temper of the Christian life.' Still we may justly expect to find it, in the main, an exponent of the views of the author on that momentous subject, and of the methods which he supposes to be most fitting and forcible for their realization. In some way or other his conception of the thing will be suggested, and not feebly, and the relation of his principles to it will be sufficiently revealed to form a judgment. Did we not so think, the book would not answer the purpose for which we have selected it, which is to record our solemn conviction of the want both of Christian character and spiritual power in the faith which its author holds and advocates. With sundry modifications, which in so Proteus-like a system are not worthy of a mention, he is a unitarian; the points in which he may be considered as differing from many of his brethren, giving him an advantage and not a disadvantage, in connexion with our present object.

Our great complaint of unitarianism has always been its destitution of that efficacy, without which the office of a religion, and especially of a revealed religion, cannot be fulfilled. It is easy, and but too common, to represent us as bigot battlers for mere opinions, intellectual images. It requires but little talent, and less candour, to describe our view of the necessity of faith as, in any sense, involving a substitution of the ideas of the understanding, for moral principles and graces. 'The belief of the truth' is needful to salvation, just because it has a natural and living connection with all that is holy and divine. The truth (our view of it, of course) is the engine of religion and holiness. It is 'the voice' of God speaking into life 'his image.' So far from putting *mere opinions* (as if any such things could be!) in the place of other and better things, we value them only with a view to those things. Differing entirely from those who seem to think, with as little philosophy as scripture, that creeds—by which we mean not doctrines printed, but believed—respecting the gravest and most gracious matters, can be separated, either as to cause or consequence, from the deepest moralities of the soul, we value the sentiments which constitute general orthodoxy, for their position and power, in relation to the sanctities and services of godliness, and, by the same rule, we disesteem unitarianism. We do not complain simply of its negative character—that is nothing, alone. It is the nature of the things which it denies, that makes the denial important. Faith is not to be judged of arithmetically. It is not the number of its points that decides its worth. There may be strong faith in a few things, and weak faith in many. But it does not follow, as a thing of course, that it will be so, and the character of the things must be considered, before we are in a condition to say

that, in any given case, it can be so. Unitarianism does reject the things whose presence and whose power are necessary to all that constitutes the worth and glory of the christian life. Tried in whatever way, and by whatever, test it can be tried, it is found deplorably defective. The application of the spiritual stethescope only discovers the unsoundness of its most vital parts.

The christian life—*what is it?* In order to an answer, we must consult the recorded statements and sentiments of those whose work it was to teach us everything respecting CHRIST. This life has some connection with him, from whom it takes its name. It is not every life that men may call the christian life, that is the christian life. There must be not only a connection of it with Christ, but a connection of the right kind and extent, to justify the application of the title. And to ascertain what that connection is, we must have recourse to those from whom we have received all we know respecting Christ, in any of the modes in which he may be contemplated. What, then, is the position assigned to Christ by the apostles in relation to this subject? Upon this point the information is abundant. There is no darkness, or dimness about their intimations. The fact is, that they were too full of this theme, not to dwell upon it with the utmost explicitness. Nothing is more striking in their writings, than the evident and entire absorption of their minds, by christian sentiments—by their ideas of Christ. So thoroughly occupied were they with them, that they express them constantly, not as if making out a case, or saving a point, or vindicating a pretension, but as from ‘the abundance of their hearts.’ They do it naturally and heartily, from spontaneous overflowing of the soul. They delight to do it. The smallest suggestion—the most incidental reference—carries them away. Rules of logic and of language, are nothing, when Christ is concerned. If they come but just in sight of him, they forego everything, or rather, they are always in sight of him—full and open sight. His lightest touch acts most magically on their hearts — the feeblest tones of his voice drown all sounds besides. So filled were they with him, that they seem never to exhaust, or scarcely to express their views; appearing not straightened, lest they should say too much, but puzzled how they should say enough respecting him. He supplies all the topics on which they would dilate. Their christian life lives only in him. He is not one thing or another thing to it, but all things. There is no principle or process of it that does not connect itself directly and fully with what he is—what he has done—his sufferings and his glory—his character and claims. He is its author and its end, its motive and its model, its rule and its reason, its soul and

its life. Such is the view which the apostles give us of Christ's relations to the life of God within us. Are these the relations which in the discourses before us, or the system which they generally represent, he sustains to it? Our objection is not that Mr. Martineau has no more verbal references to Christ. To such an objection we know what he would say; what, indeed he has said in his preface:—‘The author would have introduced a larger number of discourses having direct reference, in word as well as in spirit, to the divine ministry of Christ, did he not hope to follow up the present volume by another. * * * * In the meanwhile, he trusts that those who, in devout reading of books and men, look for that rather which *is* Christian, that which *talks* of Christianity, will find in this little volume no faint impression of the religion by which he, no less than they, desires to live.’ But not to say that *words* are, after all, the necessary body and shape of thoughts, and that the men who give us our ideas of Christ did not content themselves with any vague or infrequent allusions to him—we ask, is there not in Mr. Martineau's conceptions, what must always forbid *such references* as the apostles did continually make? Would his faith in Christ demand, or suggest, or permit them? Would any references to the ‘divine ministry of Christ,’ fulfil the meaning, realize the comprehensiveness, of apostolical statements? Or to put it in another way. If the apostles, who had the Spirit promised them to teach more fully, what Christ had taught by hints and with comparative obscurity, had held the views of Christ's relations and influence, which unitarianism in its greatest maturity embodies, would they naturally, or at all, have chosen the expressions, and uttered the descriptions, which they did? Would their forms have been the easy and genuine dictate in minds that had been Hebrew, of such sentiments as these:—Christ taught the true paternity of Providence—revealed a life immortal in words and acts—expressed a moral manifestation of God—was the living image of spiritual principles, the model man—died, that he might be denuded of his mortal relations, and be sublimated into universality? We say—not; and therefore whatever may be claimed for the life revealed in these discourses, in no way can we discern its right to be esteemed a ‘christian life.’ It is sheer delusion altogether to call it so. The book may be considered a juster exhibition of the actual place which Christ has in the author's views, than any other kind of book. It is one thing to be endeavouring to make out a sense which shall satisfy the exigencies of particular passages, but quite another to be speaking and acting out one's own views. Whatever may be said in reference to Christ's death and present relations by unitarians, under the pressure of

theological debate—what is it all, when applied to practical purposes? Nothing. There is no need or use for it. Paul's conception of the virtue and influence of Christ's death was one that made him ever look to it, when treating of the new nature. Mr. Martineau's one that requires no such recognition, nor any recognition at all. Christ is to him, in fact, *an example, and nothing more*, and a child might just as well expect to grow through beholding the reflection of a giant in the water, as a guilty, depraved creature, expect to become partaker of 'true holiness,' by gazing on his Christ.

This is not the only want of resemblance to the principles and modes of the Bible in the whole scope and strain of the discourses before us. Indeed thus tried, there is hardly a point in relation to which, whatever truth or beauty they may possess as far as they go, they do not leave the sense of miserable defect and contrast. The religion which they describe—for after all there is more description of it than any thing else—is little more than poetry. It is wonderfully denuded of personal relations. Man is a solemn, silent witness of things : he looks upon them with emotions of tenderness and awe, and that is all. The facts and sentiments that formed the staple of discourse to prophets and apostles, with which all their reasoning and persuasions had a living incorporation, and out of which their power entirely arose, these have no office or existence here. The whole universe and all within it is a picture, and has no influence but what a picture has. Impersonality is marked every where as far as religion is concerned. Not only is Christ an image, but there is little besides images to be found at all. God himself is scarcely more than one among many objects in the 'rayless scene,' which the imagination dwells upon, and were he, by some means or other, removed from the eye, no more serious consequences would ensue than the loss of a magnificence. He is a being without a government, and without a character. Sin, seldom so called, is injustice, not disobedience ; the violation of right, not rebellion against authority. Consistently enough hell is only the fruit of painful thoughts and recollection. There is anguish, but no punishment ; but by what means the anguish is to be produced, how sins are to become so painful, is not explained. Prayer is any thing but what the name imports ; the expression of reverence, sorrow, love, trust, but not prayer. It is 'not for a purpose, but from an emotion.' It is the utterance of what is, not the petition for what is desired to be. And men! why, never did they look such passive, purely passive beings as here. Had the effort been to treat them in a way most opposite to that of Christ and his disciples, a greater measure of success could not have been secured. There is consistency in this.

It is more the result of the belief, or rather of the want of belief, than of the natural habit of the author's mind. There are not—how could there be?—any charges made of ‘desperate wickedness,’ any invitations to promised blessings, any expostulations respecting sin, any warnings about perdition, any exhortations to duty. The preacher is not a preacher, though he may be a painter creating a landscape of vivid splendour or tender beauty, an anatomist exposing to our view the powers and wonders of our human nature, a lecturer displaying the mysteries of his selected science. But aught that looks like proclamation, that imports the messenger, will be sought in vain. It is all the air of the philosopher of old, not of the men that had ‘a gospel’ for the poor and guilty, and not the air alone, but all the matter too. The association, in thought alone, of such a system with the earnest missions of ancient or of modern ministries would be of all things the most grotesque. He could only be suspected of satire who should represent it as the impelling principle of such a work as Whitfield's, or the cause of such success as his. It is not in its nature to take that form. According to it, to urge to faith would be the greatest disbelief, and to command obedience nothing short of rebellion against the soul.

One of the most common, and not the least useful, tests of systems is their actual results. What they do, throws light on what they are. If men are not what they should be, and if moral excellence is the end of ‘wise efforts to do them good, we make no rash or rude demand .when religious systems, claiming to have the truth or Spirit of God, are required to show their ‘fruit.’ This is a species of utility not to be despised by any that possess it. Tried by this rule, unitarianism is ‘found wanting.’ Its working shows its worthlessness. To hint at its slow progress, or rather rapid decline, might seem ungracious, yet is it not a truth, and one not insignificant? The ‘great year of Providence’ may afford some comfort in such a state of things, but what is to be said when the actual circumstances of the case are well considered? Allowing what is not implausible, that it is difficult to substitute a simpler for a more complex faith—that men are indisposed to yield their religious sentiments when none are offered in their stead ; still are there no masses without faith at all? It may be hard to tell upon the people, who believe already in some form of Christian truth, although they have furnished ever the chief converts to unitarianism, without, so far as general observation goes, any marked improvement in their characters ; but the plea will not suffice when the question concerns the influence of Christianity as restored to its simplicity, before it was corrupted by apostolical Jews, or philosophising Gentiles, upon the altogether irreligious. Yet is there ‘no voice?’ We

ask, not what is it in the study, or the lecture-room, but what *does* it among the degraded, the vicious, the profane? Whom does it restore? 'As it was in the beginning, is now'—its moral disciples are either the growth of other faiths, or men whose circumstances or whose constitutions would guarantee their virtue. The best test of a religious system is its power to reclaim. The history of unitarian reclamations, we fear, would be a short record. But may we ask again, what is its influence where it is? Are there signs of deep religiousness? Since Belsham and Priestley confessed the undevoutness of their sect, and the greater devoutness of others, there has been, so far as we have read and seen, no change for the better. Devoutness is not the characteristic feature of public unitarian worship, whether 'prayer is by the printing press,' or by the pen, and between the preaching services and the family there is nothing to indicate its presence. Mr. Martineau may confess, and try to comfort himself respecting the neglect of secret and spiritual exercises and habits, but we can assure him that his language describes his own denomination only—a fact to which we have been familiarized by the works of men of his own faith. It has never occasioned our astonishment, nor does it now. The following passage, which may be considered as giving in few words the whole case of the views which are contained in the work before us may well forbid astonishment.

'There is nothing vainer or more hopeless than the direct struggles of the mind to transform its own affections, to change by a fiat of volition the order of its tastes, and the intensity of its love. Self-inspiration is a contradiction: and to suspend, by upheavings of the will, the force of habitual desire, is no less impossible than, by writhings of the muscles, to annihilate our own weight. This, you will say, is a hard doctrine; that our religion demands that which our nature forbids; invites a regeneration of the heart; after which, the will may strive in vain. * * * * But if Christianity presents the perplexity, its spirit affords the solution. * * * * In Christ it furnishes us with an image of divinest beauty that we may turn our eye on *that*, not upon ourselves: and perverse, even to disease, is the temper, which, instead of being engaged with that sublimest work of the great Sculptor of Souls, whines rather over its own deformity, and seeks to cure it by unnatural contortions.'

And is that all? We thought as much. 'An image!' An image of health for the sick—of wisdom for the foolish—of comfort for the wretched! Verily, it was not by an image that strongholds were pulled down, and thoughts brought into captivity to law of old; nor will they be now.

The root of the evil, after all, is very deep. A suggestion of the danger of mental pride would probably excite a smile, yet might it not be out of place. Great reverence for truth which a man be-

lieves, a reverence which may appear to absorb his whole soul, is not incompatible with a reliance upon self both absurd and sinful. It is possible to love and advocate truth with the feeling that we give to it, rather than receive from it. To work out our own faith without help from God is a labour whose pleasure is not the sweetest to the feeblest minds. One thing is certain. Mr. Martineau believes in nothing which requires a revelation, nothing for which he needs a teacher sent from God. In vain would any seek throughout his book for sentiments not found in quite as full a form in Seneca. If his is christianity, it would be hard to know what is not. He can prove, without appeal to scripture, all the principles of his religion. He eschews the thought that christianity consists of doctrines at all. His inspiration is a thing poetical as is his religion. His arguments are not humble references to what is written; he never goes to new or old covenant for evidence. On their authority he receives nothing. Indeed, on their authority alone he cannot receive any thing. Where they happen to be right, he approves of them, of course, not making their sanction an indication of error; though for things and people Jewish, he has no overwhelming love. But beyond that they have no place or influence. They may be allowed to know just so much as he—no more. Jesus—for whom he has a great poetical respect—being an ‘image’ rather than a teacher, it does not matter much that he should err occasionally—how should it be otherwise, brought up a Jew? He could not reasonably be required to be exempt from the surrounding prejudices. If he appealed to his miracles in confirmation of his mission, it matters little—what was his mission is left to be determined according to our conception of his accuracy. He was not commissioned to propagate what we esteem mistakes on other grounds. We are not learners, but judges. We decide on what is to be taught, not receive the teaching. The Christ is within us, not without.

We cannot refrain from the inquiry—Is this the likely way to truth, about the infinite, the everlasting, the holy God—the world to come—the universal government? And is this really all that the paternal providence, so vaunted, has done for us? Is all that is provided a mere moral sentiment? and, is all besides so left, that there is darkness on all questions of deepest moment, yea, on the question whether God hath meant or not to teach us truth? If it were given, What is the surest mode of error? could one more fitting be suggested, than the above? The natural fruit of such a temper is revealed abundantly in these discourses. To enforce right and love by arguments, as easily appreciated by the infidel, as by the saint—to be rather giving proofs to Christianity, than receiving them from it—to set Christ’s own teaching above the apostles, though

he promised them his Spirit on purpose to develope what his disciples could not bear from him—to quote the scripture, more for ornament than use—to treat its literal records as wildest myths—to explain away and misapply more passages than are interpreted aright—to furnish no evidence whose strength would suffer, if the whole book, as one from God, were proved a fable—whatever else all this may be, it is not to ‘tremble at God’s word;’ whatever picture it may suggest, it is not the little child receiving the kingdom; whatever process it may indicate, it is not the becoming ‘a fool’ in order to be ‘wise.’

At the same time, we must distinguish between Mr. Martineau, and the ordinary class of unitarians. He believes, doubtless, in unitarianism, as far as he believes in anything—and his rejection of the popular belief is of peculiar severity and thoroughness. He, doubtless, also means to believe in it, or ‘something better.’ But it would be unjust to suppose him the implicit adherent of one system, while he rejects another. He has wrought his way to views, and prepared his heart to concessions, which must stamp him as little less heretical in the opinion of his fellows, than we are in his. He would not like to be described as holding any system. Carrying out a true and beautiful sentiment to a mischievous and fanciful extreme, he values the dim rather than the distinct, and seems to hold clear apprehensions to be dangerous to true religion. Mysticism is the life of his affections, which he thinks are pious. He sees things in a ‘dim religious light.’ There is nothing strange, when this habit of his mind is recollected, in his perceiving a germ of excellence in many things of which he rejects the literal form; in his confessing a holy power to belong to much belief, of which he denies the truth. His sympathies are far more frequently with orthodoxy than his speech. The following reference to the incarnation is a specimen of many of his references to such like things:—

‘ Every fiction that has ever laid strong hold on human belief, is the mistaken image of some great truth; to which reason will direct its search, while half-reason is content with laughing at the superstition, and unreason with believing it. Thus, the doctrine of the incarnation faithfully represents the impression produced by the ministry and character of Christ. It is the dark shadow thrown across the ages of Christendom by his mortal life, as it inevitably sinks into the distance. It is but the too literal description of the real elements of his history; a mistake of the morally for the physically divine; a reference to celestial descent of that majesty of soul which, even in the eclipse of grief, seemed too great for any meaner origin. Indeed, how better could we speak of the life of Jesus, than in the language of this doctrine; as the submission of a most heavenly spirit to the severest burthen of the flesh; the voluntary immersion within the

shades of deep suffering of a godlike mind, and betraying its relation to eternity, while making the weary pilgrimage of time!"—pp. 33, 34.

Thus, though the doctrine be rejected, the myth is had in reverence. The truth is disowned as a fact, but acknowledged as a symbol. And that issue comes as much from the imaginative temperament, as the moral sentiments of Mr. Martineau, who seems to us not disinclined to something of more unction and more fulness than his present views supply. Unitarianism is, indeed, the last of all existing systems, in which a mind of poetry and pathos would seek its exercise or pleasure, or, being in it, feel at home. The water is too shallow for such a bark, the habitation too confined for such a tenant. 'The bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it ; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it.' Mr. Martineau feeds himself full often with the kernels of orthodox ideas, while he throws the shells away. He has burst the bonds of much that has been often, and may be easily, conceived a part of unitarianism from the place which it has held in the creed of its abettors. He has eschewed the cold and calculating philosophy of a school, now, thank God, almost extinct. His soul has vindicated its nature, and its high prerogatives, by spurning from it the materialism and utilitarianism of Priestley. He is with the tide, setting in strongly, of spiritualism, and if that puts the hope of his future orthodoxy further off, it will, perhaps, only do so to the view of superficial minds—he may find, that the dogmas he disbelieves, are but the shapes and clothing of a most potent virtue, a virtue that can quicken and promote a christian life, to which his own is but as death.

In reading Mr. Martineau's productions, we have been impressed with the little use that is made, comparatively, of our highest and most glorious principles. If it is wise to learn from an enemy, it is surely wise to learn from a polemical opponent ; and we are convinced, that much may be learned from such men as Mr. Martineau, in reference to the ministry. It is impossible to possess any familiarity with the denomination to which he belongs, without perceiving, that he has exerted a powerful influence in promoting, if not indeed in originating, in England at least, the change to which we have already adverted. Nor, has his influence been confined to his own denomination. Nor should it be. The possession of such a genius as his may be the lot of few, but the excellencies to which we refer are not the fruits of genius only. What should prevent on the part of the orthodox, a similar development to his own of the spiritualities of the things of God, and sin, and suffering, and duty, and the soul ? What is necessary, is not abandonment of our forms of

faith, but a more intense thought upon, and a more vivid sympathy with, its inward nature, its bearings on the heart. We have all that Mr. Martineau has, to allow of, and to cherish it—and far more. The very sentiments we hold which he rejects, give greater power and virtue to those he has in common with us. If we believe the rectoral character of God—believe we not his paternal, and is not that endeared thereby? Do we urge gratitude for redemption, and does this exclude disinterested love and service, or rather is not the object of it rendered far more lovely? Do we preach that God's government is one of physical force—but does this prevent its being one of moral power; is not all its physical force in order to its moral power? Do we expect that there will be penal consequences of sin—but are not these themselves the proofs and the expressions of its natural, moral, inwrought, evil? We are convinced most solemnly, that there are ways of representing our characteristic sentiments, as well as those that belong not exclusively to the orthodox, that are not used, nor dreamed of, by many who pride themselves, both on the accuracy of their creed, and on its power.

ART. III.

1. *Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Ephesier übersetzt und erklärt.* Von F. A. Holzhausen. Hannov : 1833. 8vo.
2. *Der Brief Pauli an die Ephesier erläutert und vertheidigt.* Von L. I. Rückert. Leipzig : 1834. 8vo.
3. *Commentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier.* Von G. C. A. Harless. Erlang. : 1834. 8vo.
4. *Commentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier.* Von F. K. Meier. Berlin : 1834. 8vo.
5. *Erklärung des Briefs Pauli an die Ephesier.* Von C. St. Matthies. Griefsw. : 1834. 8vo.

WITHIN these few years Germany has been prolific in commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians. Most of them, however, are not such as will satisfy the pious or the profound theologian. The riches of the gospel are contained in this portion of the New Testament; and it is not every mind that is competent to bring them forth from the expressive words in which they are there embodied, to the faith of men. Yet all the German commentators on this epistle have not been unsuccessful. There are two distinguished exceptions. Amid a host of names we find those of Harless and Olshausen, who have been eminently skillful in expounding it. We point to them with great satisfaction, as most able and efficient in this department. Their works leave nothing to be desired. Whoever possesses them need not long

for any other exposition of the epistle. We confidently recommend them to every student of the New Testament who is master of the German language, persuaded that they will not soon be surpassed in all the leading qualities which characterise proper commentary.

In reviewing the chief topics connected with the epistle to the Ephesians, the following order will be followed :—

1. The persons to whom it was originally addressed.
2. Its genuineness and authenticity.
3. The time and place at which it was written.
4. The connexion between it and the epistle to the Colossians.
5. Its contents.

As an introduction to the discussion of the topics just mentioned, we shall inquire into the correct meaning of the phrase $\eta\ \epsilon\pi\iota\zeta\omega\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\ \Lambda\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\zeta$ ‘the epistle from Laodicea,’ which, though found in the epistle to the Colossians, (iv. 16,) has an important bearing on various points connected with that addressed to the Ephesians. Three senses have been attributed to the words in question, viz., an epistle which Paul had written to Laodicea; an epistle which the church at that place had sent to the apostle; or an epistle written and sent from the city by Paul himself.

1. The current and common interpretation of the words in question is *an epistle sent to the Laodiceans by Paul*, which the Colossians are enjoined to procure from Laodicea ($\epsilon\kappa\ \Lambda\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\zeta$) when they communicated their own to the church in that place. In this way the words present an ellipsis; ‘cause the epistle to be brought from Loadicea, *which the church has received from me.*’ Such a supplement is admitted to be harsh, and the entire expression unusual. Surely $\pi\rho\circ\zeta\ \Lambda\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\zeta$, or the dative case alone, would have been more natural, and more consonant with New Testament usage. From the early existence of an apocryphal epistle that goes by the name of Paul’s epistle to the Laodiceans, it may be inferred, that this explanation on which the forgery is based, is very ancient.

2. More correct appears to be the interpretation, ‘an epistle which the Laodicean church had sent to the apostle.’ In this case also the words exhibit an ellipsis, but not so harsh as in the former. It is more facile and simple than the other. With Theodoret and Chrysostom we are inclined to adopt it. In regard to the *contents* of such a letter they cannot be known, and it is, therefore, idle to indulge in conjecture. Some have supposed that they consisted of various questions proposed by the Laodiceans to the apostle, which he answered in the epistle to the Colossians; but this may not have been the character of the letter. It is probable that the epistle to the Colossians had reference to this letter, and could not be thoroughly understood without it. If

it be asked, Why did Paul write to the Colossians what particularly concerned the Laodiceans? why did he not reply to the Laodiceans? why did he write to the former what they could not understand, and not write at all to the latter who might have understood him? it is not easy to furnish a satisfactory reply to the interrogator. We must frequently be contented with the knowledge of facts and circumstances without attempting to ascertain their causes, or to discover why they happen in a particular way. Doubtless the Spirit, under whose influence the servant of God wrote, had wise reasons for withholding him from sending an especial epistle to the Laodicean church, while He saw fit to prompt him to address the Colossians. It need not be supposed that the Colossians were *unable* to understand their own epistle, without reading that which the Laodiceans had sent to the apostle. The Laodicean letter may have led them to see in a clearer light several allusions which, but for it, they would not have apprehended so well or so distinctly. The Spirit can best determine the mode in which His purposes should be accomplished with the least expenditure as well as the simplest apparatus of means. But it is said in disparagement of this interpretation, that the epistle which the apostle had received from the Laodiceans must in this case have been sent by him to Colosse, as the christians in the latter place could not otherwise have enjoyed the privilege of reading it. And what improbability is there in believing, that Tychicus and Onesimus, who carried the Colossian epistle, were also the bearers of that which the apostle had received from the Laodiceans? or is the supposition incredible, that the Laodiceans preserved a copy of the epistle despatched to the apostle? To us neither conjecture seems absurd or improbable. The former especially commends itself to approbation.

3. The third meaning, which has been attributed to the phrase by Theophylact, needs no refutation. When Paul wrote to the Colossians, it is probable that he had not been at Laodicea.

If the second be the true meaning of the phrase, there is no ground for the supposition that an epistle from Paul to the Laodiceans has been lost. The apostle requests the Colossians to salute Nymphas who was a Laodicean (Col. iv. 15), whereas had he written to the Laodiceans in particular, he would have saluted Nymphas in that letter. The answer of Mill to this remark is of no force, viz., that Paul's object in greeting the Laodiceans in the epistle to the Colossians, was to compensate for concluding the epistle to the Laodiceans not with the words 'grace be with *you*', but 'grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.' (Ephes. vi. 24.) Both expressions are of equivalent import, implying the approbation as well as the affection of the apostle. Neither does the right interpre-

tation of the phrase favour the idea that what is commonly called the epistle to the Ephesians, was intended *in part* for the use of the Laodiceans.

Let us now examine the external evidence which has been adduced to shew, either that the words *in Ephesus* (*ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*) in the first verse were originally wanting; or that they were not inserted in *some* copies; or that *in Laodicea* (*ἐν Λαοδίκειᾳ*) stood in their place.

Basil, in his second book against Eunomius, writes thus: ‘And writing to the Ephesians as truly united by knowledge to him *who is*, he called them in a peculiar sense *those who are*, saying, ‘To the saints *who are*, and the faithful in Christ Jesus.’ For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in ancient copies.’* It has been disputed, whether the various reading referred to by Basil consisted in the article *τοῖς* prefixed to *οὐσίᾳ*, or in *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*. Mill and Kuster contend for the latter; L’Enfant and Lardner for the former. The following are L’Enfant’s arguments:—‘The various reading consists in the emphatical particle *τοῖς*, and not *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, as may appear from these several considerations, 1. St. Basil moves not the question, whether that epistle be written to the Ephesians or others. 2. At the beginning of the passage he supposeth that it was written to the Ephesians, without saying that there was any contest about it. 3. The design of Basil is to shew, that the Ephesians are justly and properly called *οὐσίαι*, ‘such as are,’ because of their union with him ‘*who is*.’ 4. The word *ἰδιαζόντως*, ‘peculiarly,’ must relate to the emphatical article *τοῖς*, which is necessary to answer to *ὁ ὦν*, ‘him *who is*,’ and which, according to Mill’s own account, is wanting in one MS. at least. This is the point: *τοῖς* was wanting in the common copies, in the time of St. Basil, but he had read it in ancient MSS., and he avails himself of it to authorise his speculation. It is true, that in his quotation he does not put the words ‘at Ephesus,’ because that was not the thing in contest, and he had mentioned it before, and he had no occasion to mention it again. Moreover, he might be disposed to omit those words, ‘at Ephesus,’ the more to favour his speculation upon *τοῖς οὐσίᾳ*, ‘such as are,’ taken in an absolute sense. 5. St. Jerome, who refutes this speculation of St. Basil, makes it turn upon the particle

* Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιχέλλων ὡς γυναικῶς ἡρωμένοις τῷ ὄντι
ἢ ἐπιγνώστεως, οὗτας αὐτοὺς ιδιαζόντως ἀνθίσασσεν, εἰπὼν. τοῖς ἀγίοις
τοῖς οὐσίαι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. οὗτω γάρ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεῖσ-
καστι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἐνρήκαμεν.—Adv. Euno-
m. lib. ii. c. 19, vol. i. p. 254, ed. Garnier.

τοῖς, and mentions not any various reading upon the place.* This is plausible and ingenious, but not convincing. It is true that Basil says at the beginning of the passage, the epistle was written *to the Ephesians*; but such an affirmation might be made in perfect consistency with the hypothesis that the letter was *encyclical*, intended in part for the Ephesians, and generally quoted as such in his time because the copies having *in Ephesus* had almost displaced the others. The beginning of the passage in Basil certainly shews, that he knew of no such reading as *ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ*; but we cannot assent to L'Enfant when he affirms that *τοῖς* was wanting in the common copies in the time of Basil, and that this father availed himself of the article as found in ancient copies, to authorize his speculation. Had the common copies wanted the article in Basil's days, it would now have been absent from many; and yet all MSS. hitherto examined, with the exception of one, exhibit it. Besides, the word *ἰδιαζόντως*, 'peculiarly,' does not so much relate *to the article by itself*, as to the participle *οὗσι*. The plain import of the passage is, that when Basil discovered *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* to be wanting after *τοῖς οὗσιν*, he eagerly seized upon that circumstance as favourable to a peculiar exposition of the *participle*. He does not state in how many ancient MSS. the phrase was omitted; perhaps they were few; but he simply states the fact of its being wanting. The artificial exposition given by Basil would scarcely have been attempted on the supposition of *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* immediately succeeding *τοῖς οὗσι*; nor is it at all probable that *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* ever stood in another position than the present, since no collated MS. assigns it a different place in the sentence.

Let us now turn to Jerome. His words are,—‘ Some are of opinion from what was said to Moses, ‘ thou shalt say to the children of Israel *he who is* has sent me,’ Exod. iii. 14; that the saints and faithful at Ephesus were also designated by a term denoting *essence*, so that from *him who is*, they are called *those who are*. This is an over-refined speculation. Others suppose, that he wrote simply not to *those who are*, but to *those who are saints and faithful at Ephesus*.† In opposition to Lardner, we must here believe, that Jerome’s allusion to the two interpretations is founded on the fact that some copies had

* Bib. Choisie, vol. xvi. p. 301 seq.; and Lardner, *Credibility*, vol. iv. p. 280. London. 1827, 8vo.

† Quidam curiosius quam necesse est, putant ex eo quod Mosi dictum sit: haec dices filiis Israel; *qui est*, misit me,—etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles, essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos, ut. . ab eo, *qui est*, hi *qui sunt* appellentur. Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos, *qui sunt*, sed *qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sunt*, scriptum arbitrantur.—*Comment. in ep. ad Ephes.*

the common reading, while others wanted ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. His own opinion was, that the epistle was addressed to the Ephesians; but the forced interpretation which he censures proceeds upon the idea, that *in Ephesus* was wanting. It is most improbable, as we have said in relation to Basil, that the fanciful exposition of the words to which Jerome alludes found ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in a different position, and laid emphasis on the participle notwithstanding.

The words of Jerome imply, that two readings existed in his day—viz., τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and τοῖς οὖσιν. He himself followed the former.

Tertullian comes next to be considered. ‘I pass by another epistle which *we* have inscribed to the Ephesians, but *heretics* to the Laodiceans.’ Again: ‘According to the true testimony of the church, we suppose that epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians. But Marcion sometimes inclined to alter the title, as if he had made a very diligent inquiry into that matter. Yet the title is of no importance, since the apostle wrote to all when he wrote to some.’* From this passage it may be inferred, that Tertullian himself believed the true testimony or tradition of the church to be, that the epistle was inscribed to the Ephesians, that Marcion and his followers called it *the epistle to the Laodiceans*, and that on some occasions Marcion wished to alter the title. It is uncertain whether Tertullian means by *title*, a *running title prefixed*, or the *inscription inserted in the epistle* at its commencement. The word *interpolare* favours the latter idea, and consequently the supposition that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was wanting in the first verse. But still, according to the *usus loquendi* of this father, *interpolare* is equivalent to *corrumpere*, whether by *adding* or *erasing*. *Title* probably means *running title*, though Lardner thinks otherwise. Tertullian does not find fault with Marcion for corrupting *the text*, but *the title*; and appeals to ecclesiastical tradition in proof of *the Ephesians* not the Laodiceans being addressed. Neither does this father appeal to MSS. as having ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the text, which certainly would have refuted the heretic. He only quotes the true ecclesiastical tradition in favour of the title *to the Ephesians*. It would therefore appear, that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was wanting in the copies known to Tertullian. But it is certainly not intimated that Marcion had ἐν Λαοδίκειᾳ where ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is

* Epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos. Cont. Marcion v. 11.

Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest cum ad omnes Apostolus scripserit dum ad quosdam. 17.

now found. *The heretic had sometimes a mind* (*gestiit aliquando*) *to alter the title*, are the words of Tertullian.

Again: Cod. B. has *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* in the margin, though from the same hand; and 67 omits it *by emendation*.

In reviewing the external evidence relative to the inscription of the epistle which has just been adduced, it appears adverse to the opinion, that the words *in Ephesus* were wanting in *the original* copies, or that *in Laodicea* stood in place of them. It favours the idea, that the former phrase was not found in *some* ancient MSS. Taking this part of the external evidence by itself, it countenances the fact that several copies did not exhibit *in Ephesus*. It is true that Lardner and others will not allow of this; but the learned writer does not interpret the passages of the fathers which have been quoted, with fairness or impartiality.

The majority of modern critics attach much greater importance to these few patristic notices than we should be inclined to allow. They look upon them as countenancing the *circular character* of the epistle; whereas, the most that can be affirmed is, that they do not contradict that hypothesis.

Let us now adduce those internal arguments which, in connexion with the preceding testimonies, are regarded as proof that the epistle was not addressed to the Ephesians alone. Had it been intended exclusively for the community at Ephesus, it is urged, that we cannot account for the absence of special references to individual members in the church, or the want of several salutations. And yet the apostle had been three years among the Ephesians; he stood in a most intimate relation to them; and he must have been acquainted with their internal affairs and the state of their Christian knowledge. (Acts, xix. and xx.) How then can he write in such a manner as would lead to the belief, that he had merely *heard* of their faith and love: ‘Wherefore I also after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and love unto all the saints.’? How can he address them as if they had arrived at the knowledge of his peculiar commission to preach to the Gentiles, and the extraordinary revelation he had received from heaven only *by report*: ‘If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward; how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery.’? The Ephesian church, too, was composed not merely of Gentiles, but of Jewish Christians; whereas the epistle is directed to the former class alone. Besides, the present letter was written and sent at the same time as that to the Colossians, in which latter Timothy is joined with the author himself in the salutation, Col. i.; and as Timothy must have been well known to the Ephesians, the omission of his name at the

commencement of this epistle is inconsistent with the notion of its being intended solely for the church at Ephesus.

In order to solve these difficulties, some propose to regard the present epistle as that addressed to the Laodiceans, and mentioned in Col. iv. 16. Such, it is alleged, was the view of Marcion, as we learn from Tertullian. But it has been already shewn, that this interpretation of Col. iv. 16 is incorrect, although Pamelius's conjecture that it was the occasion of Marcion's opinion, appears to be well founded. The old Latin version translated the passage in Colossians as speaking of an epistle *to* the Laodiceans; and if Marcion used the Latin version of Paul's epistles, as we believe, it is highly probable that he was misled by it in this instance.*

The circumstance that the apostle himself did not found the church at Laodicea, would quite accord with this hypothesis. The christians in that place were personally unknown to Paul; and the passages which now appear strange, when considered as addressed to the Ephesians, comport with the relation subsisting between the apostle and the Laodiceans. But although this view be advocated by such scholars as Grotius, Hammond, Mill, Du Pin, Wall, Vitringa the younger, Wetstein, Holzhausen, and Paley, it is inadmissible. On the supposition that Paul addressed a letter both to the Laodiceans and Colossians, he would not have included the brethren in Laodicea, in a salutation inserted in the epistle to the Colossians. It is hardly probable, too, that he should have requested the Colossians to see that the epistle especially addressed to them should be read in the Laodicean church, had the latter community been favoured with an inspired letter for their own immediate edification. There is a similarity in sentiment between the two epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians; and if the latter had been sent to the Laodiceans, what need had they to read the shorter and less rich epistle, especially as it bore a striking resemblance to their own?

Another solution, which has met with general approbation, was first proposed by Ussher, viz., that the epistle to the Ephesians was a circular letter, intended for the use of several churches in Asia Minor, including those at Ephesus and Laodicea.

The most eminent critics of modern times approve of this hypothesis. Moldenhauer, Michaelis, Koppe, Ziegler, Hänlein, Justi, Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, Flatt, Hemsen, Feilmoser,

* *The Epistle to the Laodiceans* has been supposed to be identical with the Epistle to the Hebrews by Baumgarten-Crusius, and Stein. Schneckenburger inclines to the same view. (Beiträge zur Einleit ins. N. T. p. 153 seq.) On a hypothesis so singular, Lücke and Kuinoel have animadverted with sufficient reason.

Schott, Schrader, Neander, Schneckenburger, Rückert, Credner, Guerike, Olshausen, and others, adopt it in the main, while differing in minor details. But notwithstanding these high names, the solution appears to us untenable ; and we are content to take our position along with Whitby, Lardner, Wolf, Cramer, and Morus, who adhere to the testimony of ecclesiastical tradition. For the *encyclical* character of the epistle, the external evidence is not great, as we have already seen. Indeed there is no *direct* evidence for it. There is ground for believing that *in Ephesus* was wanting in several ancient copies ; but this does not prove, that the letter was intended to be *circular*. Besides, there is an overwhelming mass of proof from MSS. versions, and ancient writers, to establish the authenticity of the phrase *in Ephesus*. This reading is unassailable, and must be regarded as the only original. As far as external evidence is concerned, it is entitled to all acceptation.

But the internal arguments already adduced, have been more insisted on than the external. Let us therefore consider the weight which they claim, and the degree of support they are entitled to give to the hypothesis of Ussher. It is said that there is no special reference to any individual member of the church at Ephesus. Not one of the saints there is saluted, though the apostle, from his three years residence among them, must have been on intimate terms with several persons. In most of his other epistles, he salutes the chief members of the community. In answer to this, Lardner states, that there is no epistle of Paul which has in it so many salutations as that to the Romans whom he had never seen. But Michaelis aptly remarks, that though the apostle might have had many friends in a place where he had never been, we must not argue, in an inverted order, that in a locality where he had spent three years, he had no friend whatever whom he deemed worthy of a salutation. Lardner subsequently gives a sufficient reply to the objection. Tychicus, who carried the epistle to the Ephesians, is required ‘to make known unto them all things, and to comfort their hearts.’ Nor is it the apostle’s *invariable* practice to insert particular salutations to members of that community which he addresses in writing. No individuals are saluted by name in either of the epistles to the Thessalonians, or in that to the Galatians.

The statement contained in Ephes. i. 15, is of no weight in the matter for which it is adduced. It merely asserts that Paul had *heard of the continuance* of their faith and love, since he had been separated from them. In the long interval between his residence at Ephesus and the time of writing the epistle, he must have received accounts of their state and progress ; and

when these were satisfactory, he gave thanks to God the Author of all good, for the steadfast walk which his converts were enabled to maintain. The apostle speaks of *the continuance* of their faith, not of the *first hearing* of it. This accords with the language of the same apostle in his epistles to Philemon and the Colossians. To the former, whose faith he knew, he writes : 'I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers, hearing of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.' To the latter, among whom he appears to have been, or of whose faith he had certainly been assured by Epaphras, he writes : 'We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you, since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints.' These parallel expressions confirm the interpretation which the most judicious commentators attach to Ephes. i. 15.

In regard to Ephes. iii. 2, 3, 4, where it is written—'If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward ; how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words ; whereby when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ ;' the particle *εἰ* rendered *if*, denotes, according to Theophylact, *forasmuch as*, or *since*. It has the same signification in Ephes. iv. 20 : 'Since ye have heard him, and been taught by him as the truth is in Jesus,' and in 2 Corinthians. v. 3 ; 'Since being clothed we shall not be found naked.' It does not imply *doubt* or *uncertainty*, but rather serves to *confirm* an assertion.

The observation of Wetstein that the present epistle is written to *Gentiles*, whereas, the church at Ephesus consisted chiefly of *Jews*, is not founded on accurate data, so far as it assumes that Jewish converts formed the great majority of the believers in that place. The learned writer appeals to such passages as Acts xviii. 19, 21, 24, 25 ; xix. 9, 10, 17 ; xx. 21 ; Rev. ii. 2, 7 ; which, however, do not justify the opinion, that Paul's preaching at Ephesus was most successful among the Jews. It is true that he testified of Christ in the synagogue ; and that various persons of the seed of Abraham who were convinced by his powerful reasoning believed. But the opposition of the Jews to him in this city is also noticed. He was compelled to depart from their synagogue, and to dispute in the school of Tyrannus. It was among the *Gentiles* that he gathered his principal fruit, 'for many of them which used curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them before all men.' An examination of Acts xix. 19—41, will sufficiently shew, that far more of the heathen than of the Jews became converts to the religion of Christ, in the idolatrous city of Ephesus.

All the churches planted by the apostle were of the same character, although individual Jews were incorporated with them. He was emphatically the apostle of the Gentiles, and naturally addressed *the mass* of the christian societies whom he had been instrumental in forming, reminding them of their former idolatry and present privileges. In the first and second chapters, the contrast is seen between heathen and Jewish christians in the use of *ημεῖς* and *ὑμεῖς*; and the transitions which the apostle makes from the one to the other, are only appropriate on the supposition, that *both* existed in the Ephesian church. But why is not Timothy's name joined in the salutation with the apostle's, since the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians were written at the same time? It is not necessary to suppose that they were written on the same day, as is here assumed. If a few days elapsed between the date of their composition, Timothy may have left the apostle to go to another place. Lardner supposes, that Timothy was at Ephesus, not Rome, when the apostle wrote to the church at the former place. Believing that the epistle to the Ephesians was written *before* that addressed to the Colossians, he accounts for the absence of Timothy's name, by supposing that the apostle's faithful companion had not then joined him in Rome. The examination of this point will come up hereafter. In the mean time it may be affirmed with the highest probability, that Timothy was *not* with the apostle when he composed his letter to the church at Ephesus, else he would have been included in the salutation.

On the whole, it seems indubitable that the Ephesians were not strangers to Paul when he wrote to them. Their condition, their trials, their enemies, their dangers, were well known to him. He had been absent from them for the space of six years, but he had heard of their steadfastness and faith. Changes doubtless had occurred among them since he had been with them; and some were dead, whom he personally knew. In those epistles which were written to churches a short time after the apostle had left them, we naturally find salutations to individuals, and greater minuteness than in the letter to the Ephesians. So is it with the epistles to the Corinthians. The *difference of time* is an important point in the account. The following passages presuppose, on the part of the writer, a good degree of acquaintance with the persons addressed: chap. i. 1—14; ii. 1, 2; iii. 13; iv. 20—24, 30; v. 8; vi. 21, 22.

The advocates of the encyclical character of the letter before us have different views of the original condition of the first verse. Olshausen thinks, either that Tychicus was furnished with several copies in which a blank was left to be filled up with the name of the town, or that copies were written out in Ephe-

sus for the use of different places ; and that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was only put into the copies intended for Ephesus and its vicinity. The present reading came to be general because Ephesus was the principal city of Asia Minor. Michaelis imagines that Paul inserted each name before he sent off the copies. Hemsen conjectures that Paul wrote out at first several copies, in one of which he wrote *in Ephesus*, in another, *in Laodicea*, and in others left a vacant space to be filled up by Tychicus as occasion might require. In this manner does he account for all the readings in the first verse, which, on his hypothesis, are equally original. There is room for a thousand other conjectures of the same kind.

There is much truth in the remark of Schneckenburger, that the entire hypothesis has a *modern* appearance. Singular indeed would it have been if Paul had desired the epistle to the Colossians to be read in the church of the Laodiceans, when he had sent an especial epistle to the Laodicean community. Singular too would it have been if the circle of churches for which the letter was destined, had not been mentioned by the epistle, and if copies with the blank unfilled were in circulation so late as the fourth century. In other *encyclical* epistles, as in those of Peter and James, there is no such blank ; while at the commencement of the epistle to the Galatians, which was designed for the use of several churches, the *country* is specified.

Moved by the force of these considerations, Schneckenburger, who thinks that the original reading was τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὐσιοῖς, believes that the letter was not meant to circulate among a definite number of churches in Asia Minor, but that it was written for *all Christians*. So also Credner. The former interprets the commencement of the first verse : ‘Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, *to the saints who are really such*,’ &c. Credner gives a different explanation more refined and unnatural. Both are unsupported by the usage of the apostle at the commencement of other epistles. Τοῖς ἀγίοις signifies *really saints, without the addition of the participle* ; and the epistle itself contains sentiments analogous to those addressed to τοῖς ἀγίοις *without the participle*, in other scriptures.

Authenticity and genuineness.

The unanimous voice of antiquity assigns the epistle to St. Paul, and attests its uncorruptness. Polycarp alludes to it in his epistle to the Philippians, chapter i. : ‘Knowing that ye are saved by grace, not by works,’ (Ephes. ii. 8) ; and chapter xii. : ‘As it is expressed in these Scriptures, ‘Be ye angry and sin not,’ and, ‘let not the sun go down upon your wrath.’’ (Ephes.

iv. 26). Ignatius, in a letter to the Ephesians written at Smyrna says, ‘Ye are the companions in the mysteries of the gospel of Paul, the sanctified, the highly-commended, deservedly most happy, at whose feet may I be found when I shall attain to God; who in all his epistle makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.’ Irenæus writes, ‘Even as the blessed Paul says in his epistle to the Ephesians, that we are members of his, body of his flesh,’ &c. Clement of Alexandria says, ‘Therefore the blessed Paul affirms, ‘I testify in the Lord,’ &c. (Ephes. iv. 17); and again in his *Stromata*, ‘Therefore also he writes in the epistle to the Ephesians,’ &c. (Ephes. v. 21). The testimony of Tertullian has been already adduced. The epistle is also contained in Marcion’s Canon, and in the list of books given by Eusebius as universally received by Christians. The Valentinians, as we learn from Irenæus, adduced in their favour such passages as i. 10; iii. 21; v. 32; Ptolemy quoted Ephes. ii. 15; and Theodotus appealed to iv. 24, 30. All succeeding writers acknowledge the epistle as an authentic production of the apostle, addressed to the Ephesians. Thus external evidence is irresistibly strong in establishing the genuineness of the letter before us. Nor is the internal less decisive or unambiguous. The structure and unusual length of the periods; the richness, variety, and elevated tone of the expressions, many of which are characteristic of the apostle; the depth of religious feeling; the warmth of heart exhibited by the writer; the outpouring of the most sublime sentiments in the most emphatic words, all refer to the great apostle of the Gentiles. It is unnecessary to allude to the doubts advanced by De Wette. They proceed from a want of sympathy with the spirit of the letter. They are the *subjective feelings* of the writer himself, rather than *objective realities*. He admits that they are not sufficient to invalidate the authenticity.

Time and place at which it was written.

At whatever time and place this epistle was composed, it is not difficult to discover that those addressed to the Colossians, and Philemon, and probably that to the Philippians, belong to the same period and locality. The four letters were written during one of the author’s imprisonments. This is shown by such passages as Ephes. iii. 1, 13; iv. 1; vi. 19; Philip. i. 7, 12, 14; ii. 17; Col. i. 24; iv. 3, 7; Philemon 9. These places direct us at once to the two occasions on which the author was confined at Rome and at Cæsarea. How then can it be ascertained whether they were written at the former or latter city? Or is there any ground for concluding that some of them

should be dated from the one, some from the other? They cannot be divided between the two captivities, because they all represent the apostle as surrounded with the same persons. These are Timothy, Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Jesus Justus, Demas, Luke, Tychicus, and Onesimus. (See Philip. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Philemon 1; Col. i. 7; iv. 12; Philemon 23; Col. iv. 10, 14; Philemon 24; Ephes. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; Col. iv. 9; Philemon 10.) It may be objected, that no mention of Timothy is made in the epistle to the Ephesians. But this circumstance can form no valid ground for concluding that the Ephesian letter should not be assigned to the same period as the other three. Harless conjectures that Timothy was a stranger to the readers of that epistle, and is not therefore noticed. The probability, however, is that he was acquainted with the Ephesian Christians, because he had accompanied the apostle through Asia (Acts xx. 4). We believe that he was absent when Paul wrote this letter. Lardner, as has been already mentioned, thinks he was at Ephesus.

Are we then to decide in favour of his captivity at Cæsarea or at Rome—the former noticed in Acts xxiii. 23—26, the latter in Acts xxviii. 30? The prevailing opinion has always fixed upon the latter. But Schulz, followed by Böttger and Schott, contends that Cæsarea was the place of his imprisonment during their composition. Wiggers inclines to the same opinion. On the other hand, Graul, in a separate dissertation on the point, Neander, Olshausen, and Guerike adhere to the ancient and prevailing hypothesis.* We shall allude to the evidence on both sides.

The apostle's close confinement at Cæsarea rendered it impossible for him to procure intelligence from the Christian churches abroad, and therefore he was scarcely prepared to write epistles to them. It is true that his acquaintance were not forbidden 'to minister or come unto him;' but such license did not extend to preaching or disputations, or to the bearing of news from him and to him. The Jews were vigilant and violent against him; the Roman governor strict; and all that his friends were permitted to do was to supply his necessities, and minister to his bodily health.

Besides, the mention of *Cæsar's house*, and *the palace*, (Philip.

* See Schulz in the Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1829, Hft. 3 p. 612 seq. Böttger's Beiträge, Theil. II. p. 47 seq. Schott's Isagoge, p. 272. Wiggers in the Theologische Stud. und Kritik, 1841, II, p. 436 seq. Graul de Schulzii et Schottii sententia, &c. Leips. 1836, 8vo. Neander's history of the planting and training of the Christian Church, (English translation,) vol. i. p. 373 seq. Olshausen in the Einleit. to his Commentar ueber Ephes. § 3, p. 131. Guerike, Historisch-Kritische Einleit. p. 370 seq.

i. 13; iv. 22), points to Rome rather than Cæsarea. These particulars, indeed, are found in the epistle to the Philippians alone, and go to prove no more than its composition in Italy; but other considerations derived from the three remaining epistles, favour their Roman origin. Paul had an opportunity of preaching the gospel, though he was a prisoner, (Ephes. vi. 19, 20), which he cannot be supposed to have enjoyed at Cæsarea. In the Acts of the Apostles we find that both Aristarchus and Luke were at Rome (xxvii. 2), while in Col. iv. 10, and Philemon 24, they are represented as with the apostle. It is exceedingly doubtful whether they were with him in Cæsarea. It is also more probable that Onesimus, a slave who had run away from his master Philemon, should have repaired to Rome than Cæsarea. The former place presented greater inducements and protection to such a person.

Much weight cannot be attached to the arguments in favour of Cæsarea; we shall therefore allude to them very briefly. In Acts xxvii. 2, it is related, that Aristarchus alone accompanied Paul and Luke from Cæsarea. In the second epistle to Timothy, which is generally acknowledged to have been written from Rome, Luke only is mentioned as with the apostle. On the contrary, we gather from Acts xx. 4, that Aristarchus, Timothy, and Trophimus were with him at Cæsarea. From these passages, and the supposed improbability of so many individuals being with the apostle at Rome, it has been inferred that he was in Cæsarea, where it was much easier for them to assemble. We object to the conclusion founded upon Acts xx. 4, that Aristarchus, Timothy, and Trophimus were at Cæsarea with the apostle, is neither certain nor probable that they visited that locality at the same time. De Wette himself allows that all the friends already enumerated might gather round Paul at Rome as well as Cæsarea; and the passages adduced to prove that only some of them were along with him at the former place, are at least as cogent as those advanced to prove that some (not all) of them were with him at the latter. The *argumentum e silentio* is precarious and uncertain. The closeness of his incarceration at Cæsarea militates against the supposition that these individuals were allowed free intercourse with the illustrious prisoner in Palestine.

It is farther alleged that Onesimus was with Paul $\pi\rho\circ\zeta\ \tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha\tau$ (Philemon 15), *very soon* after leaving his master at Colosse, a circumstance better suited to Cæsarea than Rome. But this is a wrong interpretation of the phrase $\pi\rho\circ\zeta\ \tilde{\omega}\rho\alpha\tau$. It should be taken in connection with the verb $\acute{e}X\omega\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta$, denoting that he was separated from his master *for a season*, not that he arrived *soon at the abode of Paul* after fleeing from Colosse.

The distance of the churches in Asia Minor from Rome has also been insisted on in connexion with the difficulty of procuring intelligence respecting them at so remote a locality. But surely some of the apostle's friends were employed by him on missions to these and other communities. His solicitude for the cause of Christ naturally led him to procure information as to the state of religion in the churches he had founded or visited; and the ardent companions, who evinced towards him feelings of the strongest attachment, were ready to undertake any journey for the sake of promoting Christianity.

It has also been supposed, that Paul's request to Philemon (22) to prepare a lodging at Colosse, as he trusted soon to be liberated, and to proceed to that place, is inconsistent with Rom. xv. 24, in which he avows his purpose to visit Spain, rather than return to Asia. But this determination was expressed some years before his captivity; and circumstances appear to have altered it. There is no evidence that he went into Spain.

That Cæsarea was probably the place whence the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians were sent forth, has been farther inferred from the fact, that Onesimus, the companion of Tychicus, who carried both, is not mentioned in the former epistle (Ephes. vi. 22), whereas he is introduced into the latter (Coloss. iv. 8, 9). Setting out from Cæsarea, they would reach Colosse first; and there Onesimus would remain. Hence, because he was not to proceed to Ephesus, he is not commended to the church at that place. This is more ingenious than solid. Granting its correctness, it has but a feeble bearing on the question. Again, it is stated by Wiggers, that the expressions 'whom I have sent unto you, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts,' introduced into both epistles (Ephes. vi. 22, and Col. iv. 8), intimate, that it was a matter of indifference whether Tychicus proceeded to Ephesus or Colosse first, as would be true, if he set out from Cæsarea, but not from Rome, because in the latter case, he must pass through Ephesus to Colosse.* In reply to these considerations we affirm, that there was nothing improper or unnatural in the journeying of Tychicus and his companion to Ephesus, and thence to Colosse, as would probably happen, if they started from Rome. It is true that Onesimus is not mentioned in the epistle to the Ephesians, but it was not necessary to specify him when he went with the bearer of an epistle from Paul. Having such a friend and

* This argument presupposes that the reading of Ephes. vi. 22, and Col. iv. 8, is the same. They differ in the received text. Scholz and Lachmann in their editions exhibit the text of Col. iv. 8, as the same with the corresponding text of the epistle to the Ephesians; but Griesbach, Knapp, and Tischendorf retain the received reading.

associate, he needed no introduction. The expressions which have been quoted from both epistles, do not imply, that it was a matter of indifference whether Tychicus proceeded to Ephesus or Colosse first. The bearer of the epistles probably went both to Ephesus and Colosse, delivering them in succession. On the whole, no weight can be attached to these new arguments of Wiggers. Taken separately, they are weak and inconclusive;—considered together, they are obviously irreconcilable. They neutralise each other,

Böttger has endeavoured to shew, that the expressions *the palace* (Phil. i. 13), and *Cæsar's house*, (iv. 22), might be applied to Herod's palace at Cesarea. But it is certainly doubtful, whether the residence of Herod, to whom belonged no higher title than king ($\betaασιλεὺς$), could be called *the house of Cæsar*. In view of all the arguments advanced on both sides, looking at those of Schulz and Böttger on the one hand, with Graul's observations on the other, we adhere to the opinion, that the four epistles were composed during the apostle's first captivity at Rome. The considerations in favour of this hypothesis are indeed not so decisive as to overwhelm the other, neither are they so convincing as to silence all inquiry in another direction. Yet they are much more plausible than those stated in support of Cæsarea. Let the reader attend to Ephes. vi. 19, 20, comparing these words of the apostle with Acts xxviii. 16—30, and he will probably infer, that the Roman imprisonment is meant. Besides, it is wholly uncertain, as has been already remarked, whether Aristarchus and Luke were with Paul in Cæsarea; while it is manifest that they were with him at Rome. (Acts xxvii. 2). Both are mentioned in Coloss. iv. 10, and Philem. 24. And after all that Böttger has advanced, it will be difficult to convince the unprejudiced reader, that *οὐσία Καίσαρος* has any other meaning than the imperial palace at Rome. It is freely granted that many circumstances stated in favour of the ancient opinion have little weight or worth. Yet to those mentioned, importance must be attached, especially as none of the considerations urged by Schulz and his followers, possess equal value.

Schneckenburger endeavours to steer a middle course between the traditional and modern view, by supposing that the epistle to the Ephesians was written at Cæsarea, the others at Rome. An answer to this is supplied by the preceding observations.

We come to consider the *order* in which the four epistles were written. This point cannot be precisely ascertained. Were it determined by the authority of names, the greater number are in favour of the priority of the epistle to the Ephesians to that directed to the Colossians. The apostle is thought to have written to the Ephesians first, by Theodoret, Flacius, Baro-

nius, Petavius, Ussher, Heidegger, Lightfoot, Pearson, Mill, Hammond, Hottinger, Michaelis, Schmid, Hug, Eichhorn, Feilmoser, Schott, Koehler, Schrader, Lardner, Credner, and Guerike; while the contrary is maintained by L. Capelle, J. J. Lange, De Wette, Neander, Harless, Olshausen, Steiger, and Wiggers.

The arguments for the latter view are few, and may be briefly stated. On comparing Ephes. vi. 21 with Col. iv. 7, we find in the former text the conjunction *καὶ*, thus distinguishing it from what is stated in the epistle to the Colossians: ‘But that ye *also* may know my affairs, what I am doing, Tychicus, &c. The term *also* refers to the Colossians, to whom he wrote the same words. In this case he must have taken it for granted that the Ephesians were acquainted with the contents of the letter addressed to the Colossians, or at least with the circumstance that such had been sent to the christians at Colosse.

Again: the epistle to Philemon was written at the same time as that to the Colossians, because Onesimus, who carried the former to his old master, went with Tychicus from Rome to Colosse; and we know that both were charged with the letter to the Colossians. But we also learn from Ephes. vi. 21, 22, that Tychicus was the bearer of the letter to the Ephesian church, so that it must have been written very shortly, perhaps a few days after those to the Colossians and Philemon. It is not at all probable, considering the distance, and difficulty of travelling, that Tychicus undertook two separate journeys from Rome, the one with Onesimus to Colosse and Philemon, the other to Ephesus. In addition to these arguments, it is stated by Neander, that in the epistle to the Colossians, the apostle’s thoughts exhibit themselves in their original formation and connection, as they were called forth by his opposition to that sect whose sentiments and practices he combats. The similarity of the epistles, as indicating the mind of the writer to have been occupied with the same thoughts, seem also to refer their composition to the same time.

On the other hand it has been maintained, that the epistle to the Ephesians was composed first, because Paul has not prefixed the name of Timothy to it, after his own, as he has in all the epistles he wrote when that faithful friend was at his side. Timothy was called to the capital by the fate of his master, and shared that fate with him till his liberation. (Heb. xiii. 23.)

There are also in it ‘no expressions, denoting hopes of enlargement, as there are in the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Nor does he here take notice of any successes obtained at Rome, or give any intimations of converts made by him there, as he does in Philip. i. 12, 13, 14; iv. 22. He does not intimate any advantages obtained as yet. Nor does he, at

the end of this epistle, send such salutations as at the end of the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. All which must lead us to think, that the circumstances of the apostle at writing this epistle were different from his circumstances at writing those epistles ; when his captivity, as is allowed, was near its period.*

Another argument is derived from the second chapter of the epistle to the Colossians, where the worshipping of angels, and other matters, are introduced ; whence it is concluded, that he received intelligence from those parts which he did not possess when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians. There are also a few *a priori* considerations, which, in Lardner's opinion, might induce the apostle to write to the Ephesians shortly after his arrival at Rome ; but they are of no weight or importance.

The preponderance of argument appears to be in favour of the priority of the epistle to the Colossians. As to the want of expressions denoting hopes of enlargement, in the epistle to the Ephesians, the same is equally apparent in that to the Colossians. Notices of success or of converts are also absent from both. It is true that while there is a considerable resemblance between them, there is also a marked difference. The apostle, writing to different communities, referred to different circumstances. Errors had developed themselves at the one place, which had not appeared at the other ; and unless it could be shown that the same false teaching had corrupted both places at the same time, the variety of statements does not prove an interval of time to allow of the writer receiving new intelligence. It is natural to suppose, that the errors described in the epistle to the Colossians had appeared among them earlier than among the Ephesian community. The want of salutations at the conclusion of the epistle to the Ephesians is not conclusive against the opinion that the two epistles were written at the same time. The *argumentum e silentio*, as has been already remarked, is an uncertain foundation for any hypothesis, not to mention, that Tychicus would supply, in person, the want of such salutations.

But it has been thought, that the epistle to Philemon, which was written and sent along with that to the Colossians, shows that the apostle was then expecting his immediate release, because it is said in the 22nd verse : ' I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.' Here, however, the word *shortly* is wanting ; while in Philipp. ii. 24, it is written, ' I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come *shortly*.'

By far the strongest argument for the priority of the epistle to the Ephesians is drawn from the want of Timothy's name at the beginning. Lardner thinks it quite *demonstrative* ; and Hug

* Lardner.

relies upon it with equal confidence. Eichhorn's explanation, which resolves the dissimilarity into Timothy's not being the amanuensis in the one as he was in the other, is far-fetched and visionary. Another amanuensis would have named Timothy as readily as himself, had the apostle so dictated, and the Spirit willed accordingly.

Macknight supposes that Timothy had left Rome on some necessary business before the epistle to the Ephesians was begun; 'For the apostle in his letter to the Philippians promised to send Timothy to them soon, chap. ii. 19. And in his epistle to the Hebrews, which was written after his release, he informed them that Timothy was sent away, Heb. xiii. 23.' This solution is unsatisfactory, because it proceeds on the supposition that the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, were written previously to that addressed to the Ephesians; whereas it seems to us that the epistle to the Philippians, in which Timothy's name occurs, was composed *after* that to the Ephesians.

In the brief interval between the composition of the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, we suppose Timothy not to have been present with the writer. The absence of his name from the latter leads to this conjecture, though it is now impossible to *prove* its truth, or to ascertain where he was during the short space referred to.

The epistle to the Philippians was probably written towards the conclusion of the apostle's captivity at Rome. This may be inferred from Phil. i. 12, 26, and ii. 26, &c., which presuppose the lapse of a considerable time at Rome, during which the apostle saw the good effects of his ministry. In ii. 24 he also expresses his confident hope that he should see the Philippians *shortly* face to face. If the first three epistles were written in 62, as Guerike supposes, the fourth should be assigned to 63.

The connexion between the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.

The similarity between the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians is apparent from the following parallel paragraphs:—

Ephes. i. 4—12, 19—23	= Col. i. 13—20, 24 etc.
Ephes. ii. 1—12	= Col. i. 21 etc.
Ephes. ii. 14—22, iii. 6, 9—12. iv. 15 etc	= Col. ii. 9—15.
Ephes. iv. 22 etc.	= Col. iii. 9, 10.
Ephes. iv. 29	= Col. iv. 5, 6.
Ephes. v. 18 etc.	= Col. iii. 16 etc.
Ephes. v. 21—33. vi. 1—9	= Col. iii. 18—25. iv. 1.
Ephes. vi. 18 etc.	= Col. iv. 2 etc.
Ephes. vi. 21 etc.	= Col. iv. 7 etc.*

* See De Wette's Einl. in die Bücher des N. T. dritte Auflage, p. 224; Schott's Isagoge, § 62.—Harless's Commentar, p. lxix.

From this analogy, conclusions prejudicial to both have been often drawn. Thus De Wette asserts, that the epistle to the Ephesians is nothing more than a 'verbose enlargement' of the other, without definite object or specific references; while Mayerhoff* decides that it was the original from which the Colossian letter was imitated and copied. The former is therefore disposed to question the authenticity of the Ephesian, the latter, that of the Colossian epistle. Both are in error. It should be carefully noted, that while these compositions contain analogous expressions and sentiments, they exhibit dissimilarities which give to each a character of its own.

In the epistle to the Colossians there is an avowedly polemical tendency. A heresy, which had spread through different parts of Asia Minor, is depicted in its main features, and confronted with the exhibitions of eternal truth. A system of theosophic Jewish christianity had obtained currency at Colosse, which the apostle not only describes but combats as opposed to the genuine gospel of Christ. But the letter before us bears no such controversial aspect. When closely examined it will be found to consist of living truth, exhibited with all the freshness of originality to serve for confirmation in the faith, for promoting unity and steadfastness in the hope of the gospel. In various places the Ephesians are warned against errors; but this occurs in almost all the epistles of Paul. In those passages where he so vividly shews that under the gospel both Jews and Gentiles are one—that Christ broke down the middle wall of partition between them by his cross, so that the Gentiles are freely admitted to all the privileges of the kingdom of God, there is an intimation that Judaising teachers might hereafter endeavour to disunite them, and to inculcate the necessity of the law of Moses under the spiritual economy. The apostle foresaw that the Ephesians would be exposed to the corrupt teachings of errorists similar to those who had disturbed the Galatian churches. But his language presupposes no more than the *probable* dissemination of such erroneous tenets. He inculcates truths sufficient to preserve the Ephesian believers from deserting the simplicity of the faith, not in the form of controversy but of preceptive affirmation. The great facts of christianity are brought forth in their quickening energy from the gushing fulness of his own heart, where they had been implanted by the Divine Spirit. With apostolic fidelity he endeavours to persuade his readers to abide in the belief of one Lord, one faith, one baptism which they already professed, without being tossed to and

* Der Brief an die Kolosser mit vornehmlicher Berücksichtigung der drei Pastoral schreiben geprüft, 105 seq.—Berlin, 1838, 8vo.

fro by every wind of doctrine, and to grow up in living conformity to the Head of the church, by bringing out into exercise all the virtues that do not less adorn than indicate the character of the believer. Thus he refutes error by emphatically teaching the truth, while he appears rather to view the existence of doctrinal errors as *probable* than as *already developed*.

Contents of the Epistle.

Like most of the Pauline epistles the present is divided into two parts, a *doctrinal* and a *practical*; the former embracing the first three chapters, the latter the remaining three. *Three* paragraphs in the doctrinal portion may be distinctly traced.

I. (a). i. 1—15. After the salutation, the apostle praises God the Father for the spiritual blessings bestowed upon the Ephesians and all other saints, in consequence of their eternal election in Christ.

(b). i. 15—ii. 10. The writer then gives special thanks to God for the faith and love manifested by the Ephesian believers, and states that his unceasing prayer on their behalf was, that God would bestow on them a higher measure of knowledge and understanding, by which they might learn the greatness of the power exerted in quickening them together with Christ, though they had formerly been dead in trespasses and sins; and be enabled, after their new creation, to bring forth fruit to the praise of that grace which abounded in the entire work of salvation.

(c). ii. 10—iii. 21. The apostle contrasts their former condition as heathens, with their present state after conversion, making special allusion to the fact, that the separation between Jew and Gentile was done away by Christ; so that both were joined together in him, as one spiritual body. In this united state the apostle compares them to a temple of God built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets. He is then led to speak of his own mission to the Gentiles, the object of which was to make them sharers of the promised blessings, in intimate fellowship with the Jews; so that the church consisting of Jew and Gentile might exhibit the manifold wisdom of God, according to his eternal purpose. He exhorts them not to be weary in their Christian course, and prays that they may be replenished with strength, faith, love, and knowledge, to the full measure of their capacity.

In the *practical* part, *four* paragraphs may be distinguished.

II. (a). iv. 1—16. The apostle beseeches them to keep the unity of the faith and to avoid divisions, informing them that all the different offices and stations in the church were intended

to promote the edification, unity, and perfection of the entire body.

(b). iv. 16—v. 21. He exhorts them no longer to walk after the manner of the heathen, but to put off the old man, and to be renewed in the spirit of their minds; annexing a series of moral precepts appropriate to Christians in all circumstances.

(c). v. 21—vi. 9. From general, the apostle passes to special relations, treating *first* of the duties belonging to wives and husbands, and representing the conjugal connexion as similar to that subsisting between Christ and his church; *secondly*, of the reciprocal duties of parents and children; and *thirdly*, of the duties arising out of the relation between master and servant.

(d). vi. 9—24. His language again becomes general. Believers are described as soldiers fighting for truth and righteousness against a host of enemies, and the spiritual armour they need in so great a conflict is minutely stated. In conclusion, the apostle requests an interest in the prayers of the Ephesian Christians, refers them to Tychicus the bearer of the epistle, who should inform them of his personal circumstances, and closes with the customary benediction.

Art IV. *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review.* By Francis Jeffrey, now one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland. 4 vols. 8vo. London: Longman & Co.

THE publication of the Edinburgh Review, which commenced in 1802, constitutes an important era in our literature. The distinguished ability of its projectors, the fearlessness with which they addressed themselves to their calling, the manly tone which they assumed, the enlarged sphere and freshness of their criticisms, and the general impartiality of their verdict, raised the character and gave an impulse to periodical literature, which greatly raised it above its former level. In addition to this, it must in justice be mentioned, that the liberal tone of its political disquisitions, and its unsparing exposure of tory profli-gacy, scattered the seeds of many political reforms subsequently realised, and did more, probably, than any other agency to break up the quietude and slothfulness of the public mind. In all these respects, a large debt of gratitude is due to the conductors of this journal, which we are the more concerned to acknowledge as truth compels us to add that, in one department of their labours, and that the most important, they egregiously

erred, and did fatal service against the highest interests of their species. The irreligion and infidelity conspicuous in various forms throughout the earlier volumes of the work, was matter of deep regret to many who sympathised with the politics, and admired the talent and scholarship of the journal. In this respect, however, the Edinburgh Review did but reflect the then state of our literature. An unnatural conjunction had been formed, between infidelity on the one hand, and literature and science on the other; so that the guardianship of pursuits, which ought to have enfranchised the human mind from prejudice, elevated its aspirations, and purified its hopes, was entrusted to the keeping of a frivolous and unholy spirit, which laughed at all seriousness, and turned religion to scorn. The most melancholy feature of the case, so far as it concerned the Edinburgh Review, was the fact, which soon became notorious, that its most objectionable articles,—those which gave deepest pain to the most sincere friends of religion, were supplied by a clergyman of the English church, whose official position ought at least to have imposed some sense of decency on his prurient pen. We have no pleasure in dwelling on this theme, and should not have referred to it, had we not felt that its omission would have involved our own faithfulness in doubt. For some time past, a marked improvement has been perceptible, not only in the absence of what is positively pernicious, but in the distinct recognition of the paramount authority and special character of the christian revelation. Papers are from time to time admitted which would scarcely have passed muster in former days. Serious things are treated with respect, homage is done to the supremacy of religious truth, and approximations are not unfrequently made to a more formal exhibition of the distinctive attributes of the christian character and system. In the memoirs of Mr. Horner, reviewed in our journal for May last, several interesting notices occur of the early history of the Review. Its projectors were Mr Horner, the Rev. Sydney Smith and the author of the volumes now before us, who soon united with themselves several other young men of corresponding views and of eminent talents. The sequel is well known, and the public have long been familiar with the results of their labours.

‘The Edinburgh Review,’ Lord Jeffrey remarks in his preface to this publication, ‘it is well known, aimed high from the beginning:—And, refusing to confine itself to the humble task of pronouncing on the mere literary merits of the works that came before it, professed to go deeply into *the principles* on which its judgments were to be rested; as well as to take large and original views of all the important questions to which those works might relate. And, on the whole, I think it is now pretty generally admitted that it attained the end it aimed at. Many

errors there were, of course—and some considerable blunders; abundance of indiscretions, especially in the earlier numbers; and far too many excesses, both of party zeal, overweening confidence, and intemperate blame. But with all these drawbacks, I think it must be allowed to have substantially succeeded—in familiarising the public mind (that is, the minds of very many individuals) with higher speculations, and sounder and larger views of the great objects of human pursuit, than had ever before been brought as effectually home to their apprehensions; and also, in permanently raising the standard, and increasing the influence of all such occasional writings; not only in this country, but over the greater part of Europe, and the free States of America: while it proportionally enlarged the capacity, and improved the relish of the growing multitudes to whom such writings were addressed, for ‘stronger meats,’ which were then first provided for their digestion.’—p. ix.

Mr. Jeffrey wrote the first article in the first number of the Review, and his last contribution appeared in October, 1840. He was sole editor from 1803 till 1829, when, in consequence of being elected Dean of the Faculty of Advocates, he honourably resigned the appointment. His present judicial position naturally enough disinclined him—to say nothing of other considerations,—to concur in a republication of papers written during a period of nearly forty years, many of them probably in haste, and some, under the impulse of other influences than those which ought to sway the judgment of an upright critic. ‘No reasonable man,’ he remarks, ‘could contemplate without alarm a project for reprinting, with his name, a long series of miscellaneous papers—written hastily in the intervals of graver occupations, and published anonymously, during the long course of forty preceding years!—especially if before such a suggestion was made, he had come to be placed in a situation which made any recurrence to past indiscretions or rash judgments peculiarly unbecoming. I expect, therefore, to be very readily believed when I say, that the project of this publication did not originate, and never would have originated with me; and that I have been induced to consent to it, only after great hesitation, and not without misgivings, which have not yet been entirely got over.’ We shall be glad to find that the encouragement afforded to such reprints, induces other leading contributors to our periodical literature, to disinter some of their writings from the mass amidst which they at present lie buried. The examples of Christopher North, the Rev. Sidney Smith, Mr. Macauley, and Lord Jeffrey, constitute an authority, under which other critics may, without presumption, seek to rescue a portion of their lucubrations from the oblivion into which they must otherwise pass.

His assent to the publication, under the sanction of his name,

was at length ceded to the earnest solicitations of the publishers of the Review, and whilst we readily admit the force of the scruples which he entertained, we rejoice at the conclusion to which he ultimately came. The papers selected constitute less than one-third of those contributed by their author, and have been preferred on a principle which will be best explained in his own words:—‘I have honestly endeavoured to select from that great mass, *not* those articles which I might think most likely to attract notice by boldness of view, severity of remark, or diversity of expression, but those much rather which, by enforcing what appear to me just principles, and useful opinions, I really thought had a tendency to make men happier and better.’

Such is, in brief, the history of this publication, which, with others of a similar nature, is indicative of a change now passing over our literature. Whatever that change may bode, we believe it on the whole to be an omen of good. We receive these *contributions* with pleasure, and rejoice in the accessible form in which they are now placed before the public.

It is not our design to attempt anything in the way of criticism on the contents of these volumes. We shall neither search after blemishes, nor analyze the manifold beauties by which they are distinguished. Other brethren of the craft are free to attempt this, but we at once frankly acknowledge that it does not consist with our notions of propriety, or come within our projected scope at present. We shall therefore—approving as we do in general, both the critical judgments, and the moral tone of the papers before us—attempt little more than to inform our readers of their general character, and to supply them with such specimens as will enable them to judge for themselves of the value and attractions of the publication. The public have been too long familiar with Lord Jeffrey’s style as a reviewer, and its verdict is, on the whole, so favourable, that we need not detain our readers by any attempt to analyze it. Mr. Horner correctly described both its defects and its excellences so early as November, 1802. Speaking of the first number of the Review, he says—‘Jeffrey is the person who will derive most honour from this publication, as his articles in this number are generally known, and are incomparably the best. I have received the greater pleasure from this circumstance, because the genius of that little man has remained almost unknown to all but his most intimate acquaintances. His manner is not, at first, pleasing. What is worse, it is of that cast which almost irresistably impresses upon strangers the idea of levity, and superficial talents. Yet there is not any man whose real character is so much the reverse. He has indeed a very sportive and playful

fancy, but it is accompanied with very extensive and varied information, with a readiness of apprehension almost intuitive, with judicious and calm discernment, with a profound and penetrating understanding. Indeed, both in point of candour and of vigour in the reasoning powers, I have never personally known a finer intellect than Jeffrey's, unless I were to except Allen's.*

The papers are arranged under seven divisions, the titles of which are as follows :—1. General Literature, and Literary Biography ; 2. History, and Historical Memoirs ; 3. Poetry ; 4. Philosophy of the mind, Metaphysics, and Jurisprudence ; 5. Prose works of Fiction ; 6. General Politics ; 7. Miscellaneous.

One of the most favourable indications of our recent literature, is the disposition, growingly prevalent, to look back beyond the wits of Queen Anne's reign, to the more masculine and profound intellects which shed their glory on an earlier period of our history. Whatever advantage has accrued to our native tongue, in the way of refinement and polish, from the labours of the former class, has been purchased by the sacrifice of higher qualities, which were nobly exhibited by the latter. These qualities may yet be recognised in the writings of Shakspere, Spence, Bacon, Milton, and Taylor. They survive to reproach a degenerate age,—the monuments of an intellectual greatness, in comparison with which, we are dwarfs. The idolatry paid to their feeble though elegant successors, has at length, we trust, found its limits, and will give place to a sounder and more healthful direction of the public mind. A better service cannot be rendered to our youths than that they should be led back from Addison, Dryden, and Pope, whatever were their excellencies—and we are not insensible to them—to the nobler spirits who first provoked the English intellect, stirred the depths of its emotions, and led on its generous enthusiasm to the profoundest speculations, or the most manly pastimes. Lord Jeffrey's reference in 1811 to these writers, is couched in terms which, though impassioned, are not beyond their merit.

'The æra to which they belong, indeed, has always appeared to us by far the brightest in the history of English literature,—or indeed of human intellect and capacity. There never was, anywhere, anything like the sixty or seventy years that elapsed from the middle of Elizabeth's reign to the period of the Restoration. In point of real force and originality of genius, neither the age of Pericles, nor the age of Augustus, nor the times of Leo. X., nor of Louis XIV., can come at all into comparison : For, in that short period, we shall find the names of almost all the very great men that this nation has ever produced,—the names of

* Horner's Memoirs, Vol. i. p. 205.

Shakspeare, and Bacon, and Spenser, and Sydney,—and Hooker, and Taylor, and Barrow, and Raleigh,—and Napier, and Milton, and Cudworth, and Hobbes, and many others ;—men, all of them, not merely of great talents and accomplishments, but of vast compass and reach of understanding, and of minds truly creative and original ;—not perfecting art by the delicacy of their taste, or digesting knowledge by the justness of their reasonings ; but making vast and substantial additions to the materials upon which taste and reason must hereafter be employed, —and enlarging, to an incredible and unparalleled extent, both the stores and the resources of the human faculties.

‘ Whether the brisk concussion which was given to men’s minds by the force of the reformation had much effect in producing this sudden development of British genius, we cannot undertake to determine. For our own part, we should be rather inclined to hold, that the reformation itself was but one symptom or effect of that great spirit of progression and improvement which had been set in operation by deeper and more general causes ; and which afterwards blossomed out into this splendid harvest of authorship. But whatever may have been the causes that determined the appearance of those great works, the fact is certain, not only that they appeared together in great numbers, but that they possessed a common character, which, in spite of the great diversity of their subjects and designs, would have made them be classed together as the works of the same order or description of men, even if they had appeared at the most distant intervals of time. They are the works of giants, in short—and of giants of one nation and family ;—and their characteristics are, great force, boldness, and originality ; together with a certain raciness of English peculiarity, which distinguishes them from all those performances that have since been produced among ourselves, upon a more vague and general idea of European excellence. Their sudden appearance, indeed, in all this splendour of native luxuriance, can only be compared to what happens on the breaking up of a virgin soil, where all indigenous plants spring up at once with a rank and irrepressible fertility, and display whatever is peculiar or excellent in their nature, on a scale the most conspicuous and magnificent. The crops are not indeed so clean, as where a more exhausted mould has been stimulated by systematic cultivation ; nor so profitable, as where their quality has been varied by a judicious admixture of exotics, and accommodated to the demands of the universe by the combinations of an unlimited trade. But to those whose chief object of admiration is the living power and energy of vegetation, and who take delight in contemplating the various forms of her unforced and natural perfection, no spectacle can be more rich, splendid, or attractive.

‘ In the times of which we are speaking, classical learning, though it had made great progress, had by no means become an exclusive study ; and the ancients had not yet been permitted to subdue men’s minds to a sense of hopeless inferiority, or to condemn the moderns to the lot of humble imitators. They were resorted to, rather to furnish materials and occasional ornaments, than as models for the general style of composition ; and, while they enriched the imagination, and insensibly improved the taste of their successors, they did not at all restrain their

freedom, or impair their originality. No common standard had yet been erected, to which all the works of European genius were required to conform; and no general authority was acknowledged, by which all private or local ideas of excellence must submit to be corrected. Both readers and authors were comparatively few in number. The former were infinitely less critical and difficult than they have since become; and the latter, if they were not less solicitous about fame, were at least much less jealous and timid as to the hazards which attended its pursuit. Men, indeed, seldom took to writing in those days, unless they had a great deal of matter to communicate; and neither imagined that they could make a reputation by delivering commonplaces in an elegant manner, or that the substantial value of their sentiments would be disregarded for a little rudeness or negligence in the finishing. They were habituated, therefore, both to depend upon their own resources, and to draw upon them without fear or anxiety; and followed the dictates of their own taste and judgment, without standing much in awe of the ancients, of their readers, or of each other.

'The achievements of Bacon, and those who set free our understandings from the shackles of papal and of tyrannical imposition, afford sufficient evidence of the benefit which resulted to the reasoning faculties from this happy independence of the first great writers of this nation. But its advantages were, if possible, still more conspicuous in the mere literary character of their productions. The quantity of bright thoughts, of original images, and splendid expressions, which they poured forth upon every occasion, and by which they illuminated and adorned the darkest and most rugged topics to which they had happened to turn themselves, is such as has never been equalled in any other age or country; and places them at least as high, in point of fancy and imagination, as of force of reason, or comprehensiveness of understanding. In this highest and most comprehensive sense of the word, a great proportion of the writers we have alluded to were *poets*; and, without going to those who composed in metre, and chiefly for purposes of delight, we will venture to assert, that there is in any one of the prose folios of Jeremy Taylor more fine fancy and original imagery—more brilliant conceptions and glowing expressions—more new figures, and new applications of old figures—more, in short, of the body and soul of poetry, than in all the odes and the epics that have since been produced in Europe. There are large portions of Barrow, and of Hooker and Bacon, of which we may say nearly as much: nor can any one have a tolerably adequate idea of the riches of our language and our native genius, who has not made himself acquainted with the prose writers, as well as the poets, of this memorable period.

'The civil wars, and the fanaticism by which they were fostered, checked all this fine bloom of the imagination, and gave a different and less attractive character to the energies, which they could not extinguish. Yet, those were the times that matured and drew forth the dark, but powerful genius of such men as Cromwell, and Harrison, and Fleetwood, &c.—the milder and more generous enthusiasm of Blake, and Hutchison, and Hampden—and the stirring and indefatigable spirit of Pym, and Hollis, and Vane—and the chivalrous and accomplished loyalty

of Strafford and Falkland; at the same time that they stimulated and repaid the severer studies of Coke, and Selden, and Milton. The drama, however, was entirely destroyed, and has never since regained its honours; and poetry, in general, lost its ease, and its majesty and force, along with its copiousness and originality.'—vol. ii., pp. 284—288.

As a contrast to the foregoing, we adduce the following critique on the style of Swift, one of the most distinguished writers of the latter period:—

'Of his style, it has been usual to speak with great, and, we think, exaggerated praise. It is less mellow than Dryden's—less elegant than Pope's or Addison's—less free and noble than Lord Bolingbroke's—and utterly without the glow and loftiness which belonged to our earlier masters. It is radically a low and homely style—without grace and without affectation; and chiefly remarkable for a great choice and profusion of *common* words and expressions. Other writers, who have used a plain and direct style, have been for the most part jejune and limited in their diction, and generally give us an impression of the poverty as well as the tameness of their language; but Swift, without ever trespassing into figured or poetical expressions, or ever employing a word that can be called fine, or pedantic, has a prodigious variety of good set phrases always at his command, and displays a sort of homely richness, like the plenty of an old English dinner, or the wardrobe of a wealthy burgess. This taste for the plain and substantial was fatal to his poetry, which subsists not on such elements; but was in the highest degree favourable to the effect of his humour, very much of which depends on the imposing gravity with which it is delivered, and on the various turns and heightenings it may receive from a rapidly shifting and always appropriate expression. Almost all his works, after the Tale of a Tub, seem to have been written very fast, and with very little minute care of the diction. For his own ease, therefore, it is probable they were all pitched on a low key, and set about on the ordinary tone of a familiar letter or conversation; as that from which there was little hazard of falling, even in moments of negligence, and from which any rise that could be effected, must always be easy and conspicuous. A man fully possessed of his subject, indeed, and confident of his cause, may almost always write with vigour and effect, if he can get over the temptation of writing finely, and really confine himself to the strong and clear exposition of the matter he has to bring forward. Half of the affectation and offensive pretension we meet with in authors, arises from a want of matter,—and the other half, from a paltry ambition of being eloquent and ingenuous out of place. Swift had complete confidence in himself; and had too much real business on his hands, to be at leisure to intrigue for the fame of a fine writer;—in consequence of which, his writings are more admired by the judicious than if he had bestowed all his attention on their style. He was so much a man of business, indeed, and so much accustomed to consider his writings merely as means for the attainment of a practical end—whether that end was the strengthening of a party, or the wounding a foe—that he not only disdained the reputation of a

composer of pretty sentences, but seems to have been thoroughly indifferent to all sorts of literary fame. He enjoyed the notoriety and influence which he had procured by his writings; but it was the glory of having carried his point, and not of having written well, that he valued.'—vol. i., pp. 223—234.

In characterising his own productions, Lord Jeffrey informs us in his preface, that he 'constantly endeavoured to combine ethical principles with literary criticism, and 'more uniformly and earnestly than any preceding critic made the moral tendencies of the works under consideration a leading subject of discussion.' As a confirmation of this remark, we may adduce, amongst others, the papers on Byron and Burns, in both of which occur remarks as creditable to the moral tone of the writer, as his warm-hearted and generous acknowledgment of the merits of the two poets is to his literary judgment. It is well known that in the case of Lord Byron's first publication, the 'Edinburgh Review' failed to detect the poetic power which was subsequently displayed. This is no marvel, for most journals would probably do the same if the materials for their judgment were equally restricted. The truth of the matter is, that *The Hours of Idleness* did not presage the brilliant career which his lordship subsequently pursued. We view it in connexion with that career; and, therefore, wonder at the blunder of the critic, forgetting that our judgment is influenced by circumstances of which he was necessarily ignorant. As in some other cases, where similar errors had been committed, reparation was handsomely made, and the warmest tribute which a generous admiration could offer was paid to his lordship's genius. This admiration, however, was not blind or unreflecting, as the following passage, which we commend to the special consideration of our young readers, will shew:

'We have a word or two to say on the griefs of Lord Byron himself. He complains bitterly of the detraction by which he has been assailed—and intimates that his works have been received by the public with far less cordiality and favour than he was entitled to expect. We are constrained to say, that this appears to us a very extraordinary mistake. In the whole course of our experience, we cannot recollect a single author who has had so little reason to complain of his reception—to whose genius the public has been so early and so constantly just—to whose faults they have been so long and so signally indulgent. From the very first, he must have been aware that he offended the principles and shocked the prejudices of the majority, by his sentiments, as much as he delighted them by his talents. Yet there never was an author so universally and warmly applauded, so gently admonished—so kindly entreated to look more heedfully to his opinions. He took the praise, as usual, and rejected the advice. As he grew in fame and authority, he aggravated all his offences—clung more fondly to all he had been reproached with—

and only took leave of Childe Harold to ally himself to Don Juan ! That he has since been talked of, in public and in private, with less unmixed admiration—that his name is now mentioned as often for censure as for praise—and that the exultation with which his countrymen once hailed the greatest of our living poets, is now alloyed by the recollection of the tendency of his writings—is matter of notoriety to all the world ; but matter of surprise, we should imagine, to nobody but Lord Byron himself.

' He would fain persuade himself, indeed, that for this decline of his popularity, or rather this stain upon its lustre—for he is still popular beyond all other example, and it is only because he is so that we feel any interest in this discussion ;—he is indebted, not to any actual demerits of his own, but to the jealousy of those he has supplanted, the envy of those he has outshone, or the party rancour of those against whose corruptions he has testified ;—while at other times he seems inclined to insinuate, that it is chiefly because he is a *Gentleman* and a *Nobleman* that plebeian censors have conspired to bear him down ! We scarcely think, however, that these theories will pass with Lord Byron himself—we are sure they will pass with no other person. They are so manifestly inconsistent, as mutually to destroy each other—and so weak, as to be quite insufficient to account for the fact, even if they could be effectually combined for that purpose. The party that Lord Byron has chiefly offended, bears no malice to Lords and Gentlemen. Against its rancour, on the contrary, these qualities have undoubtedly been his best protection ; and had it not been for them, he may be assured that he would, long ere now, have been shown up in the pages of the Quarterly, with the same candour and liberality that has there been exercised towards his friend Lady Morgan. That the base and the bigotted—those whom he has darkened by his glory, spited by his talent, or mortified by his neglect—have taken advantage of the prevailing disaffection, to vent their puny malice in silly nicknames and vulgar scurrility, is natural and true. But Lord Byron may depend upon it, that the dissatisfaction is not confined to them—and, indeed, that they would never have had the courage to assail one so immeasurably their superior, if he had not at once made himself vulnerable by his errors, and alienated his natural defenders by his obstinate adherence to them. We are not bigots or rival poets. We have not been detractors from Lord Byron's fame, nor the friends of his detractors ; and we tell him—far more in sorrow than in anger—that we verily believe the great body of the English nation—the religious, the moral, and the candid part of it—consider the tendency of his writings to be immoral and pernicious—and look upon his perseverance in that strain of composition with regret and reprehension.

' He has no priestlike cant or priestlike reviling to apprehend from us. We do not charge him with being either a disciple or an apostle of Satan ; nor do we describe his poetry as a mere compound of blasphemy and obscenity. On the contrary, we are inclined to believe that he wishes well to the happiness of mankind—and are glad to testify, that his poems abound with sentiments of great dignity and tenderness, as well as passages of infinite sublimity and beauty. But their general tendency we believe to be in the highest degree pernicious ; and we even

think that it is chiefly by means of the fine and lofty sentiments they contain, that they acquire their most fatal power of corruption. This may sound at first, perhaps, like a paradox ; but we are mistaken if we shall not make it intelligible enough in the end.

' We think there are indecencies and indelicacies, seductive descriptions and profligate representations, which are extremely reprehensible ; and also audacious speculations, and erroneous and uncharitable assertions, equally indefensible. But if these had stood alone, and if the whole body of his works had been made up of gaudy ribaldry and flashy scepticism, the mischief, we think, would have been much less than it is. He is not more obscene, perhaps, than Dryden or Prior, and other classical and pardoned writers ; nor is there any passage in the history even of Don Juan, so offensively degrading as Tom Jones's affair with Lady Bellaston. It is no doubt a wretched apology for the indecencies of a man of genius, that equal indecencies have been forgiven to his predecessors : but the precedent of lenity might have been followed ; and we might have passed both the levity and the voluptuousness—the dangerous warmth of his romantic situations, and the scandal of his cold-blooded dissipation. It might not have been so easy to get over his dogmatic scepticism—his hard-hearted maxims of misanthropy—his cold-blooded and eager expositions of the non-existence of virtue and honour. Even this, however, might have been comparatively harmless, if it had not been accompanied by that which may look, at first sight, as a palliation, the frequent presentation of the most touching pictures of tenderness, generosity, and faith.

' The charge we bring against Lord Byron, in short, is, that his writings have a tendency to destroy all belief in the reality of virtue—and to make all enthusiasm and constancy of affection ridiculous ; and this, not so much by direct maxims and examples, of an imposing or seductive kind, as by the constant exhibition of the most profligate heartlessness in the persons who had been transiently represented as actuated by the purest and most exalted emotions—and in the lessons of that very teacher who had been, but a moment before, so beautifully pathetic in the expression of the loftiest conceptions. When a gay voluptuary descants, somewhat too freely, on the intoxications of love and wine, we ascribe his excesses to the effervescence of youthful spirits, and do not consider him as seriously impeaching either the value or the reality of the severer virtues ; and in the same way, when the satirist deals out his sarcasms against the sincerity of human professions, and unmasks the secret infirmities of our bosoms, we consider this as aimed at hypocrisy, and not at mankind : or, at all events, and in either case, we consider the Sensualist and the Misanthrope as wandering, each in his own delusion—and are contented to pity those who have never known the charms of a tender or generous affection. The true antidote to such seductive or revolting views of human nature, is to turn to the scenes of its nobleness and attraction ; and to reconcile ourselves again to our kind, by listening to the accents of pure affection and incorruptible honour. But if those accents have flowed in all their sweetness, from the very lips that instantly open again to mock and blaspheme them, the antidote is mingled with the poison, and the draught is the more deadly for the mixture !—Vol. ii., pp. 365
—369.

We are tempted, though in danger of exceeding our limits, to transfer to our pages a short extract from an article on Burns, illustrative of the same honourable characteristic of the reviewer. The article, as a whole, is highly laudatory, but the admiration of the poet is happily not permitted to overlook, or, as in some cases has happened, to change into virtues the vices by which his writings are defaced. We can afford space only for a small portion of that which we should like to extract.

' But the leading vice in Burns's character, and the cardinal deformity, indeed, of all his productions, was his contempt, or affectation of contempt, for prudence, decency, and regularity ; and his admiration of thoughtlessness, oddity, and vehement sensibility ;—his belief, in short, in *the dispensing power* of genius and social feeling, in all matters of morality and common sense. This is the very slang of the worst German plays, and the lowest of our town-made novels ; nor can anything be more lamentable, than that it should have found a patron in such a man as Burns, and communicated to many of his productions a character of immorality, at once contemptible and hateful. It is but too true, that men of the highest genius have frequently been hurried by their passions into a violation of prudence and duty ; and there is something generous, at least, in the apology which their admirers may make for them, on the score of their keener feelings and habitual want of reflection. But this apology, which is quite unsatisfactory in the mouth of another, becomes an insult and an absurdity whenever it proceeds from their own. A man may say of his friend, that he is a noble-hearted fellow—too generous to be just, and with too much spirit to be always prudent and regular. But he cannot be allowed to say even this of himself ; and still less to represent himself as a hairbrained sentimental soul, constantly carried away by fine fancies and visions of love and philanthropy, and born to confound and despise the cold-blooded sons of prudence and sobriety. This apology, indeed, evidently destroys itself : For it shows that conduct to be the result of deliberate system, which it affects at the same time to justify as the fruit of mere thoughtlessness and casual impulse. Such protestations, therefore, will always be treated, as they deserve, not only with contempt, but with incredulity ; and their magnanimous authors set down as determined profligates, who seek to disguise their selfishness under a name somewhat less revolting. That profligacy is almost always selfishness, and that the excuse of impetuous feeling can hardly ever be justly pleaded for those who neglect the ordinary duties of life, must be apparent, we think, even to the least reflecting of those sons of fancy and song. It requires no habit of deep thinking, nor anything more, indeed, than the information of an honest heart, to perceive that it is cruel and base to spend, in vain superfluities, that money which belongs of right to the pale industrious tradesman and his famishing infants ; or that it is a vile prostitution of language, to talk of that man's generosity or goodness of heart, who sits raving about friendship and philanthropy in a tavern, while his wife's heart is breaking at her cheerless fireside, and his children pining in solitary poverty.

' This pitiful cant of careless feeling and eccentric genius, accordingly, has never found much favour in the eyes of English sense and morality. The most signal effect which it ever produced, was on the muddy brains of some German youth, who are said to have left college in a body to rob on the highway ! because Schiller had represented the captain of a gang as so very noble a creature. But in this country, we believe, a predilection for that honourable profession must have preceded this admiration of the character. The style we have been speaking of, accordingly, is now the heroics only of the hulks and the house of correction ; and has no chance, we suppose, of being greatly admired, except in the farewell speech of a young gentleman preparing for Botany Bay.'—*Ib.* 394, 395.

A large space is allotted to the poems of Crabbe, partly, as Lord Jeffrey states, because he thinks more highly of him than of most of his contemporaries, and partly because, as he imagines, less justice has been done him. Whatever the ground of the selection, we are not disposed to quarrel with his lordship for having devoted upwards of one hundred pages to the productions of this author, as we sympathize with the preference of the reviewer, and have been much gratified by the hearty approval, and discriminating criticisms with which the several papers abound. Crabbe's poetry is much less ambitious than that of many of his contemporaries. There is less effort, less straining after effect, less of that brilliancy which produces vulgar admiration, and exhausts both the writer and the reader by the unnatural force put on the intellect. But there are qualities of deep and permanent value in his writings,—profound observation, great mastery of the passions, truthfulness to nature, and nice pencilings of human life, which will serve to sustain his reputation, when the fashion of the age has passed away.

The following is Lord Jeffrey's sketch, taken from the first of the papers reprinted in these volumes :

' His characteristic, certainly, is force, and truth of description, joined for the most part to great selection and condensation of expression ; that kind of strength and originality which we meet with in Cowper, and that sort of diction and versification which we admire in 'The Deserted Village' of Goldsmith, or 'The vanity of Human Wishes' of Johnson. If he can be said to have imitated the manner of any author, it is Goldsmith, indeed, who has been the object of his imitation ; and yet his general train of thinking, and his views of society, are so extremely opposite, that, when 'The Village' was first published, it was commonly considered as an antidote or an answer to the more captivating representations of 'The Deserted Village.' Compared with this celebrated author, he will be found, we think, to have more vigour and less delicacy ; and while he must be admitted to be inferior in the fine finish and uniform beauty of his composition, we cannot help consider-

ing him as superior, both in the variety and the truth of his pictures. Instead of that uniform tint of pensive tenderness which overspreads the whole poetry of Goldsmith, we find in Mr. Crabbe many gleams of gaiety and humour. Though his habitual views of life are more gloomy than those of his rival, his poetical temperament seems far more cheerful; and when the occasions of sorrow and rebuke are gone by, he can collect himself for sarcastic pleasantry, or unbend in innocent playfulness. His diction, though generally pure and powerful, is sometimes harsh, and sometimes quaint; and he has occasionally admitted a couplet or two in a state so unfinished, as to give a character of inelegance to the passages in which they occur. With a taste less disciplined and less fastidious than that of Goldsmith, he has, in our apprehension, a keener eye for observation, and a readier hand for the delineation of what he has observed. There is less poetical keeping in his whole performance; but the groups of which it consists are conceived, we think, with equal genius, and drawn with greater spirit as well as far greater fidelity.

' It is not quite fair, perhaps, thus to draw a detailed parallel between a living poet, and one whose reputation has been sealed by death, and by the immutable sentence of a surviving generation. Yet there are so few of his contemporaries to whom Mr. Crabbe bears any resemblance, that we can scarcely explain our opinion of his merit, without comparing him to some of his predecessors. There is one set of writers, indeed, from whose works those of Mr. Crabbe might receive all that elucidation which results from contrast, and from an entire opposition in all points of taste and opinion. We allude now to the Wordsworths, and the Southeyes, and Coleridges, and all that ambitious fraternity, that, with good intentions and extraordinary talents, are labouring to bring back our poetry to the fantastical oddity and puling childishness of Withers, Quarles, or Marvel. These gentlemen write a great deal about rustic life, as well as Mr. Crabbe; and they even agree with him in dwelling much on its discomforts; but nothing can be more opposite than the views they take of the subject, or the manner in which they execute their representation of them.

' Mr. Crabbe exhibits the common people of England pretty much as they are, and as they must appear to every one who will take the trouble of examining into their condition; at the same time that he renders his sketches in a very high degree interesting and beautiful—by selecting what is most fit for description—by grouping them into such forms as must catch the attention or awake the memory—and by scattering over the whole such traits of moral sensibility, of sarcasm, and of deep reflection, as everyone must feel to be natural, and own to be powerful. The gentlemen of the new school, on the other hand, scarcely ever condescend to take their subjects from any description of persons at all known to the common inhabitants of the world; but invent for themselves certain whimsical and unheard-of beings, to whom they impute some fantastical combination of feelings, and then labour to excite our sympathy for them, either by placing them in incredible situations, or by some strained and exaggerated moralisation of a vague and tragical description. Mr. Crabbe, in short, shows us something which we have all seen, or may see, in real life; and draws from it such feelings and

such reflections as every human being must acknowledge that it is calculated to excite. He delights us by the truth, and vivid and picturesque beauty of his representations, and by the force and pathos of the sensations with which we feel that they are connected. Mr. Wordsworth and his associates, on the other hand, introduce us to beings whose existence was not previously suspected by the acutest observers of nature ; and excite an interest for them—where they do excite any interest—more by an eloquent and refined analysis of their own capricious feelings, than by any obvious or intelligible ground of sympathy in their situation.'—Vol. iii. p. 5—7.

We need say nothing further to commend these volumes to our readers. It would be difficult to select an equal number containing within similar compass so much instructive and interesting matter. From some of the judgments pronounced we dissent; from some of the views broached respecting authors and parties we widely differ ; but as a whole, we commend the publication as one of the most attractive and informing which our readers can possess.

Art. V. 1. *An Examination of the Principles and Tendencies of Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist ; in a Series of Letters to a friend.* By the Rev. B. Godwin, D.D., &c. 8vo. pp. 82. London : Jackson and Walford.

2. *A complete View of Puseyism, exhibiting from its own writings its twenty-two tenets, with a careful refutation of each tenet. Also an exposure of their tendencies, &c. &c.* By R. Weaver. 8vo. pp. 188. London : Jackson and Walford.

If we were members of the church of England, conscientiously such, under the conviction that it was really a sound, sincere, and protesting church against the errors of Romanism, and for the gospel of Jesus Christ, we confess that its present condition would inevitably force upon us, one of two inferences—either that its constitution cannot preserve the supposed protestantism of the nation, and that, therefore, as a protestant establishment, it has become a nullity ; or else that an overwhelming majority of its present ministers are become traitors to its principles, and are insidiously labouring to approximate its doctrines, rites, and discipline, to the pattern of their 'holy mother,' with a view to their ultimate identification with that standard from which it has been hitherto supposed they stood 'far as the poles asunder,' and are therefore become manifest enemies to the true religion. If an honest protestant of the church of England should be led, though slowly yet surely, to the latter of these conclusions, we

do not see how he can avoid the first, as a corollary, naturally and inevitably attaching to it. For with all the advantages of royal headship, and constitutional legislation, the church is now proved unable to preserve its protestant character. The 'Great Fact' here stands forth confessed, even by unquestionable authorities, that the clergy are far gone towards Rome, that they are employing every manœuvre to carry the people along with them, and that for ten years the movement has been unchecked, and has even bid defiance to every opponent. The utter imbecility of the constitutional authorities over the church, to say nothing of their suspected sympathy and gratification in the movement, demonstrates one most important truth, to which the nation is slowly opening its eyes and ears, but which it will surely at last learn—that state-endowed, and state-ruled churches, not only afford no guarantee for the maintenance of the gospel of Christ, but are themselves the greatest source of peril and corruption—the most formidable impediment which that gospel has to encounter. It was a pertinent and significant question put by no less distinguished a person than Lord Bacon—*'Why the civil state should be purged, and restored by good and wholesome laws, providing remedies, as time breedeth mischiefs; and, contrariwise, the ecclesiastical state should still continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration now for five and forty years, and more?'* and we may now add a couple of hundred years to the five and forty, and say—this long experience has not only failed to produce any defecation of the church, but has shown that nearly the whole has become a mash of Romish dregs.

The existence of what is denominated the national religion, that is, its external form and character, as well as a support for its ministers, it is for the nation itself to determine. The question is thrown into the hands of the public by the circumstances of the times. The officers of the church who come most into contact with the people, are confessedly no longer protestant. The distinguishing tenets of protestantism are abandoned, with the utmost audacity. All the fundamental principles of popery are openly advocated, and in high places. The heads of the church look on in silent apathy, or smiling acquiescence; the sovereign majesty, 'who alone hath supreme authority in controversies ecclesiastical within this realm,' is mute; the legislature and the government, who originate all laws for the regulation of church and state, virtually say it is no concern of theirs, and they will not needlessly take a serpent by the tail;—and so the whole matter is left, daily growing worse, or, perhaps, if we could foresee its issues, we might say, growing better; for it may be thus, that church and state will most effectually and most speedily work out that divorce which would undoubtedly tend to

promote the domestic peace, order, and morality of the parties whose union has proved as disastrous in its results, as it was illicit in its formation, because contrary to the laws of the church's divine Founder. We say the entire question is now happily and fairly placed before the nation, (and by the nation, not by the church, not by the legal head of the church, not by the parliament or government, must it, and will it, be settled)—whether the existence of an establishment answers its only plausible purpose—the security, purity, and universal dissemination of the protestant religion—that is, the religion of the bible only?

The two great divisions of the established religion, from the peculiar circumstances in which they are placed, or have placed themselves, are both thrusting this question upon public investigation. The solemn inquisition is commencing, and commencing under such circumstances as augur well for the cause of the gospel. Let us draw the attention of our readers to the principal points of agreement and of difference between these two established forms of the protestant religion. They are both compelling the nation to inquire whether an establishment answers its alleged purpose or not; and consequently whether any establishment of christianity by the civil power is a good or an evil, viewed in relation to the success of true religion among the people?

Let it be first observed, that the two establishments are forcing the question into notice in different ways. In Scotland it is the revival of spiritual religion within the established church, which has caused both its clergy and its laity to feel the irksomeness of state-legislation—nay, even the incompatibility of that legislation with what they understand by the headship of Christ over his own spiritual body: in England the case is the reverse. It is the corruption of the church within itself—the deviation of its ministers from what the people have understood to be its doctrines, and the attempts of those ministers to pervert their establishments to purposes altogether adverse to the reasons of its foundation, which is constraining the people to inquire—of what use is our establishment, if all our laws and all our payments cannot preserve in the land the pure religion which our forefathers thought they had bequeathed to us, when they reformed themselves from popery—and established, as they imagined, the Bible, and the Bible only, as the religion of our church? It is a singular coincidence that the question should thus be worked at both ends. If the 'Great Fact' of the English church becoming corrupt, and thereby making it a grave question whether the establishment had not better be abolished, had stood alone—the advocates of the theory might have said that the case was not a fair one, because it might so have happened that in-

stead of the growth of Puseyism, there might have risen in its place an equally rapid and extensive growth of evangelical principle—and that this would have worked well in proof of the utility of establishments of true christianity, and so they might have parried the particular case of Puseyism as a mere accident, and no genuine fruit of an established church. But such a mode of parrying the testimony of the ‘Great Fact,’ is most effectually and happily superseded by another ‘Great Fact,’ which it specially behoves the admirers of establishments to consider—it is that the corresponding growth of evangelism in an established church equally tends to show its inutility, though in a different way—because it proves that the very increase of real religion tends to make the trammels of the state incompatible with the vigour and strength of the piety which in the first instance other causes had cherished. In Scotland the love of christian liberty among ministers and people has outgrown the stature prescribed by the establishment, and the sons of freedom have nobly disdained to be held in bondage even at the high bidding of their masters; and so the uselessness of establishments has been proved by the injuries they would have inflicted upon the cause of christianity, in imposing on it a strait-waistcoat. In England the uselessness, and something more, is proved by the almost universal counteraction of sound protestant doctrine, which is the fruit of those popish predilections to which the established clergy have yielded. Try an establishment by its tendency to accomplish or defeat its own end, and you see in England popery turning protestantism out of doors. Try an establishment by its tendency either to promote or to check spiritual religion—and you see it in Scotland compelling all that is vital in christianity to fly off as from a centre of intense repulsion. If the clergy become *too bad* under an establishment, they teach us its mischiefs—as here: if they become *too good*, they cannot bear it, as in the north. Let the clergy outgrow the genius of their establishments, as in Scotland, and they repudiate its authority; let them degenerate under its influence, as in England, and both clergy and establishment will be repudiated together by the people. Experience, therefore, shows, at the present moment, that our establishment cannot prevent its clergy from degenerating so far as to turn that which was meant for a blessing into a curse; while the other establishment shows that if circumstances favour the growth of piety, then that very piety will in the end generate such a deference to the ‘crown rights of the Redeemer,’ as shall expel the civil magistrate from his throne in the church-courts, and so upset the theory of an establishment. In both cases the ‘Great Fact’ tends to the same issue, and it is a most instructive one at the present moment—the inexpediency of establishments

altogether; and the high probability—we had almost said, *certainty*, that the religion of Jesus Christ would, by this time, have been in a far better state without them; and the growing probability, that God in his providence is about to make them dissolve and vanish away under the hands of their supporters. It is demonstrated that they suit only a state of somnolency or indifference to all religion—a state of spiritual torpor and death—when the people take no sort of interest in the subject, but leave the whole matter, with the careless acquiescence of good slaves, to the arbitration of their masters—the court and aristocracy. But let the establishment glaringly attempt to defeat or reverse the idea which it has all along held before the mind of the nation, and it will set the nation upon inquiring into its utility or its injuriousness. On the other hand let it be so well constructed, so simple and inoffensive an establishment, that it shall not prevent the growth of true and spiritual religion, but rather to a considerable degree stimulate it, and give scope for the development of its vitality, and then that vitality, like the chrysalis, shall burst its dry shell, and show to the world, as the free church is now showing, that evangelical religion can not only subsist in a nation without state connexion, but as the Scotch themselves are protesting, *better without it than with it*. Here too then, the inutility of an establishment is proved by experience.

Although the results of the two 'Great Facts' in England and Scotland are thus substantially identified; yet there is one material point of difference which ought to be noticed. The facts throw a flood of light upon the characters of the men, and the character of their piety respectively. In England the traitorous and purjured clergy would willingly sacrifice the establishment, if they might be allowed at the same time to sacrifice the accredited protestantism of the nation to the supremacy of the clergy. They would consent to become independent of the state; nay, they have even claimed to be so, but it is with the view of making the church supreme over the state. Here is eminently conspicuous the peril to the civil liberties of the nation which has always been threatened by the ambition of an established church. It is never contented till it subjugates the throne and the civil state to its own ends. In Scotland, on the contrary, rather than sacrifice their religious principles, the spiritual principles of their presbyterian church, they have sacrificed their establishment. As soon as they were informed that their *status*, as an established clergy, depended upon their forfeiting what they held to be the religious principles of their church, they nobly said, Let the establishment go—and let us hold fast by our church. Our piety, and the religious freedom of our people,

are more precious than our stipends and our manses. It is only casting ourselves off the rotten raft of the establishment, and landing upon the rock of the Divine promise. We do but give up man for God—sense for faith; the exchange may be new to us, it may test us, but, in the strength of God, we will try it.' This resolution was worthy of men who emulated the piety and devotedness of presbyterian confessors and martyrs. It was a step that could not fail to draw down the Divine benediction. It was a step powerfully calculated to awaken and command the admiration and homage of all that is pure, and generous, and pious in the hearts of christian men through every province of the Redeemer's empire.—But look at the contrast presented by Puseyism—look at the baseness that takes protestant endowments while doing popish drudgery!—look at the jesuitical craft which is hypocritically pretending to re-set the broken limb of the Reformation!—look at servants who are receiving pay to sell their master! Look at the evangelical piety which is dwindling into maudlin mummery, gospel truth that is giving place to the beggarly elements of the world; at the messengers who should bring 'glad tidings of great joy,' contending for white or black dresses, genuflections and wax candles; look at bishops, priests, and deacons ready to tear off one another's canonicals, and eat one another up, in their strife after apostolical succession, sacramental grace, and priestly efficacy. Look at England with its masses ignorant as heathens, and overrun with infidelity, while its established teachers are trusting to the efficacy of baptismal regeneration, the potency of confirmation, the mystery of consubstantiation or transubstantiation to save the poor souls that never heard a gospel sermon, and are now less likely than ever to do so! Look at the men who are sworn to the holy scriptures, as the sole rule of their protestant religion, multiplying crucifixes and postures, enforcing saints' days and vigils, recommending confessionals and prayers for the dead, while the people perish for lack, not of the mass, but of that bread that came down from heaven—not for the water of baptism, but for the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon their consciences.

There is another circumstance to be observed in the contrast between our two establishments. The one that has suffered disruption is, and always has been, the best—the least corrupt—the least under worldly and state influence—the one that has always had the largest measure of evangelical leaven within it—the one that has uniformly possessed most of the respect and affection of its people—consequently the one that has done most for the benefit of the people, and been least liable to be weakened by the inroads of dissenters of any class. It has always

been incomparably more efficient in diffusing christian knowledge. Its clergy have not indeed felt the influence of the same worldly lure of great prizes, but it has secured to them all a decent competency ; and they have been vastly more free and independent in their pastoral relation—far less liable to annoyance either from parishioners or spiritual authorities. Their personal condition, therefore, has been, as a whole, greatly superior to that of their episcopalian brethren. So that the reasons and feelings of attachment to it may fairly be supposed to have been as strong as it is possible for good men to feel to the system they espouse. And we cannot withhold our opinion, formed after an intimate acquaintance with the subject for many years, that their establishment was really as good as any human system worked by imperfect creatures, can be expected to be. Whereas, on the other hand, the English establishment is as corrupt, as wicked, as worldly, as tyrannical, and anti-christian, both in theory and practice, as it is possible for any ecclesiastical system to be, that is not absolutely Romish. Yet what a contrast is presented in the conduct of the good men, the evangelical section pertaining to both. The one party finding their principles endangered by their continuance in the establishment, forsake it, and so preserve the influence of their evangelical doctrine unimpaired, nay, invigorated in the land ; the other party are content to be overborne by Romish errors rather than give up their establishment—are content to see evangelical piety trodden under foot, and step by step rooted out, rather than abandon their state-support ; yea, would remain to be stung to death by the hornets of Puseyism, and till their adherents dwindle away to utter insignificance, rather than cease to be established clergymen, and take their rank among the evangelical but despised sectaries. When shall we behold such a number of English clergy, not to say an equal proportion of the entire body, making such a stand, such a costly sacrifice, for the purity of the gospel church ? Although there cannot be a question, that the reasons which should induce it in the case of England, are a thousand to one both more and stronger than those that have caused the secession in Scotland. But there are no such signs of life, of sterling principle, of heroism, of union, of determination to be free, among our evangelical clergy. The very system in which they have been brought up, and to which they are as habituated as to their mother tongue, has quenched their manly feelings and emasculated their piety. Viewed on a large scale, and in reference to the enterprising, aggressive, and extending genius of Christianity, it has become a poor, puling, disappointed, spiritless, powerless thing. It has helped to put Puseyism where it now is, and it is frightened

out of its wits lest Puseyism should put it out of the church,—or what is the same thing, make the church too hot for it. But a few more years of tory administration in church and state, aided by Oxford theology, and there will be nothing to fear for evangelism in the church of England, because there will be none to fear for. The bolder, which is the smaller class, will forsake it silently, one by one, or be harrassed out by such bishops as those of Exeter; the older and sleeker, which are the larger class of evangelicals, will no doubt continue to preach orthodoxy in their parishes, keep at home, live in brotherly-love with the Puseyites who curse them, and finally die not at the stake, but in their nests; while all the younger branches will go over to the new school, and come out full-grown Puseyites. This melting away of the evangelical party of the church of England has long since commenced, is now visible to the nation, and in less than twenty years will be completed, unless some new and unforeseen change should take place. But as things now are, the cause of evangelism in the English church is utterly hopeless. Its permanence cannot be anticipated, we should think, even by its most sanguine friends. It is already *in extremis* under the grasp of a giant. There was a time when its advocates might have done much for the cause of truth and the evangelization of the land; but its leaders were impeded by their armour, and they possessed not courage enough to cast it aside. They thought to reform the church from within; but now the church from within is reforming them with a vengeance; and the cause of evangelism has fallen almost exclusively into the hands of the despised dissenters and Wesleyans. They are the only parties remaining that can wage the war with popery and Canterburyism on the broad arena of the nation. The sympathies of the people, even of the church, are with them. They are every where contending for *the article of a standing or falling church*, efficiently, and successfully. England has not yet turned traitor to the glorious cause of the reformation, whatever may be the case with the clergy, the aristocracy, and the universities. And whatever the court, the government, or the church may be, with the entire bench of bishops, if they please, at its head, the people will be protestant, and they will be more protestant than they have been, even though they must forsake their churches and go to chapels and meeting-houses to find it. The evangelical clergy may still continue to think more of their establishment than of the gospel; more of their forms and ceremonies than of the salvation of perishing sinners; but their people will think less. The passive tame ness with which they have witnessed the wide-spread plague that is ruining the souls of the people, will ere long receive its

reward. Eli shall not have a son left to stand before the Lord. But the Lord will have his witnesses throughout the land. The signs of increasing enterprize, energy, devotedness, and union in the cause of the gospel, are bursting forth among all the evangelical bodies of dissenters. Thus though in the church 'it is dying and making no sign,' it is advancing to manhood elsewhere; and England, the first among the nations to lift up a standard for beleaguered truth and gospel liberty at the reformation, is not yet prepared to see that standard lowered. It may pass, and probably will pass, from the established church into the hands of the dissenters, who have always rallied the most closely round it; but if it does, the people of England, we yet believe, will follow it.

As to Scotland and the secession from the establishment, the protestantism of England will reap no inconsiderable advantage from the 'Great Fact,' and the many little facts it draws with it—for facts, like errors, go in clusters. The deputations of the Scottish ministers to the south will do more good, and in more ways, than we have space to explain. Truth is contagious, especially when it comes with the air of freshness, and force of novelty to the mind. The Scottish ministers are, for the first time in their lives, experiencing the power and influence of some, yea, of many truths and principles which are so old, and familiar, and well established among dissenters, that they had almost become effete. The Scotch grasp them with the energy of mental youth, with the conviction that it is for their life; and these principles, though nothing new to English dissenters, are advocated with a heartiness, energy, and singleness of purpose which is literally thrilling through the nonconforming communities, and effecting a resurrection of their love of religious liberty. The free-church people and ministers have vaulted over an abyss horrific to all establishment people: but the ease with which they have done it—the dignity and grace of the movement—the safety, liberty, and success which they have experienced since they quitted the enchanted ground, cannot fail to prove a recommendation of voluntaryism—cannot fail to shake the confidence of establishment advocates, must inevitably make their affections sicken, and their fears rise high. Who would undertake in 1844 to lecture at the Hanover Square rooms upon the advantages, &c. of established churches? We should like to see the man, who, braving the misfortunes of the cause since it fell into the hands of a Chalmers and a M'Neill, would now muster heroism enough, nay hardihood enough, we had almost said effrontery enough, to summon an audience in London to hear a defence of establishments of Christianity! It is well indeed that the deputations, establishment men as they may still be in theory, re-

solved before they set out to say nothing about establishment principles. The old proverb it seems, is as well known at Edinburgh as in London,—*the least said soonest mended*—for as one of them observed, ‘ We have done with our establishment, and—as far as we can see—for ever.’ So we believe. For such an establishment as these gentlemen say they thought theirs was—or such as they thought to make it—they have found out did not exist. Moreover, they have been told that such an establishment as they want is Utopian, and shall not exist, by the powers that rule establishments—and such an one, they will pardon us for adding, ought not to exist—even though it were as pure as the Free Church could make or wish it. A church sustained by taxation ought to be amenable to the law and the civil courts. An establishment must be held by strong fitters, or it might become anything that human caprice, or human infirmity, or human ambition might make it; just as truth or error, reason or selfishness, ruled the hour. An established church, free even in its spirituals, has never been. The rulers of the world will take care that it shall never be. Only let the men, who have inscribed on their banner, ‘ the crown rights of the Redeemer,’ remain true to their principle, and they will live and die practical voluntaries. They may now bless God that their own labours had not quite destroyed voluntaryism out of the land; but that after battling against it for many a year, it was yet found vigorous enough for its duty on the day of trial.

Our readers will begin to suspect that we have overlooked the valuable works at the head of this article. Their authors must forgive us, if in the extensive subject to which they draw our thoughts, we have seemed to slight the particular branch of it brought under discussion. The general bearing of the controversy respecting establishments is at the present moment more interesting, and incomparably more important, than the settlement of particular doctrines. The religious liberty of the nation is at stake by the growth of Puseyism. Let the question of establishments be settled by the formation of a correct public opinion, and the detail of doctrines will follow the supremacy of the bible. We have no intention, however, of here making our bow to the excellent authors whose works are before us. They have both done good service to the cause of truth, and deserve our hearty commendation.

Dr. Godwin has confined his attention to the notorious sermon by Dr. Pusey on the ‘ Eucharist.’ His letters were occasioned by the impression made by the sermon on the mind of a friend; and if sound sense, powerful reasoning and scriptural statement could effect the removal of such an impression, it must have been done by these excellent letters. The childish absurdity of consubstantiation, which some of our readers may

not be aware, is a sort of sublimated absurdity, designed to be a substitute for transubstantiation, signifies the co-existence of the real body and blood and divinity of Christ with the bread and wine in the eucharist. Transubstantiation affirms that the bread and wine are miraculously changed in consecration from their apparent elements into the body, blood, and divinity of Christ. Consubstantiation affirms that bread and wine remain, but the body, blood, and divinity of Christ are really added to them. There is not a pin to choose between the two definitions. The 'tremendous mystery' which the priestly conjurors pretend, in order to frighten the ignorant and bind the superstitious, is identical in both cases. Dr. Godwin has treated the entire subject with great ability, and has clearly vindicated the sacred text from any such imputation as either doctrine would involve. The usual arguments are distinctly stated and brought within a small compass. There is only one omission which we have noticed; it is, however, important. The use of the substantive verb—*is*—for *represents*, *resembles*, or other like verb, is accounted for by the absence of such a verb in the vernacular of the time. The constant use of *is* when we should use some verb expressing resemblance, of which we have many, shews that there is no sort of necessity to adhere to the literal sense of *is*, in the institution of the supper. Everything else agreeing with the symbolical nature of the elements, there can be no force in the argument of Dr. Pusey, that reverence for the words of Christ requires us to understand—this *is* my body, literally. The Doctor knows well enough that the idiom as well as the resources of the language led constantly to the use of *is* for the idea of *represents*, *stands for*, *resembles*. The fact has been often enough pointed out in the controversy. Dr. Godwin has rendered an important service to protestant truth. His letters are well adapted to circulation, not only where Puseyism has made impression, but where it has not, to fortify the mind against its assaults. Few who had read these letters carefully would be inveigled by the childish absurdities of Pusey to look favourably upon consubstantiation or transubstantiation. We abstain from citation, because we really have not room for it; and a specimen of a continuous argument is like shewing a brick for a house. Let it suffice that we state our opinion, upon our critical responsibility, that the work is both well written and ably argued. We cordially wish it an extensive circulation.

Mr. Weaver's volume, which is of moderate size and price, takes up the whole system of the Tractarians, distinctly states their anti-protestant notions, and concisely exposes and refutes them. It does so with admirable calmness, clearness, and force.

Those who wish to see a complete view of Puseyism, and a concise answer to its heresies, cannot do better than procure this volume. Multitudes yet have very imperfect knowledge of its nostrums, and few would even attempt the task of reading through the tracts. To such, this volume will impart all the information they need. We have seen nothing equal to it for general circulation. It ought to be in every vestry library, and in the hand of all our Sunday-school teachers and young people. It will be perfectly intelligible to all. Other works abound which are more learned, elaborate, and argumentative. But this is in all respects adequate for popular use, and will, we have no doubt, be found eminently useful to those whose leisure allows little time for reading, but yet who ought to be informed upon the subject. Mr. Weaver deserves well of the public for the pains he has taken to give a fair and unobjectionable view of Puseyism, and to supply a rational and scriptural refutation. We abstain from quotation for the reason already given. The length of our article precludes it. Let our strong recommendation suffice.

Art. VI. *Report from the Select Committee on Postage, together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 14th August, 1843.*

The State and Prospects of Penny Postage, as developed in the Evidence taken before the Postage Committee. By Rowland Hill. C. Knight and Co. 1844.

It is with considerable gratification we reflect that we were among the very first to urge upon the public the importance of Mr. Rowland Hill's plan for post-office reform. We were among its earliest and warmest advocates, and by directing the attention of the influential body we address, contributed, we trust, to arouse the strong spirit among the people which compelled its enactment by the legislature.* We then confidently anticipated the religious, moral, scientific, literary, and social benefits that would follow from a cheap, frequent, and rapid post; and, as far as the experiment has been already tried, our anticipations have been completely realized. The progressive increase of the number of letters from week to week, from month to month, from year to year, has almost resembled in regularity the operations of the tidal laws. It shows, what any unprejudiced and attentive observer of man must have known, the depth, extent,

* See 'Eclectic Review' for July, 1838, Art. viii.

and force of the desire for social communication. It shows, that whether the immediate *subject* be the post-office, the railway, the steamboat, or commerce, the *principle* is the same; and that man is only prevented from an almost indefinite extension of his communication with his fellow-man, by the restrictive and absurd laws which have so long prevailed in the intercourse of nations and individuals, but which, happily, a true philosophy has arisen to expose.

Our readers are well aware that the plan of Mr. Hill was, in principle at least, adopted by the ministers, (one of the useful measures for which the people are indebted to the late Whig government,) and that the intelligent inventor was appointed by the lords of the Treasury, at the suggestion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Baring, to superintend its execution. The Treasury minute of September 14, 1839, states that, ‘My Lords have determined to avail themselves of the assistance of Mr. Rowland Hill in making the necessary alterations for the penny postage.’ And Mr. Baring, in a letter of the same date, tells Mr. Hill,—

‘With respect to the position in which you will be placed,* I would explain, that you will be attached to the Treasury and considered as connected with that department, with reference to the proposed alterations in the post-office. You will have access to the post-office, and every facility given you of inquiry, both previously to the arrangements being settled and during their working. With respect to the money arrangements, I understand the employment to be secured for two years certain, at the rate of £1500 per annum; I shall also add that the employment is considered as temporary, and not to give a *claim* to continued employment in office at the termination of these two years. Having put duly upon paper a memorandum of our conversation, I cannot conclude without expressing my satisfaction that the Treasury are to have the benefit of your assistance in the labour which the legislature has imposed upon us; and my conviction, that you will find from myself and the Board, that confidence and cordiality which will be necessary for the well working of the proposed alterations.’

Under this arrangement Mr. Hill continued two years in office, and on the 1st September, 1841, Mr. Baring again addressed him:—

‘As it may be satisfactory to you to have in writing the position in which I consider you at present to stand, I propose to put on paper my views, in order that you may use it for the information of my successor. I wish therefore to state, that some time ago I informed you in reference to the post-office business, that I thought it would be of great advantage to continue your services beyond the two years originally settled; that I did not deem it expedient to make any engagement beyond one year, but that you might consider, that for one year from the expiration

* Mr. Baring to Mr. Hill, 14th September, 1839.

of the former two years, your services were engaged on the same conditions as before. I think it but justice to you not to conclude this letter without expressing to you my thanks for *the unwearied and zealous assistance which you have given me in the carrying on the post-office business.* I feel satisfied, that without that assistance *it would have been scarcely possible for the Treasury to have given any proper consideration to the arrangements necessary for the putting the scheme into effect,* and I am happy in having to record *my entire satisfaction with the manner in which you have conducted the business* of your office. You will make what use you please of this letter by showing it to my successor.'

The event here contemplated by the chancellor of the exchequer, soon arrived. The efforts of united monopolists, coupled with the dissatisfaction of the people at many sins of omission in the Whigs, gave Mr. Baring 'a successor ;' and that successor took the opportunity of *dismissing* the useful public functionary from the place he was holding with so much advantage to the people, whose representative he emphatically was.

'Feeling,' says Mr. Goulburn,* 'that the time is arrived at which *your further assistance may safely be dispensed with*, I take the opportunity of apprising you that *I do not consider it advisable to make any further extension of the period of your engagement, beyond the date assigned to it by the Lords of the Treasury.* In making this communication, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of expressing *my sense of the satisfactory manner* in which, during my tenure of office, you have discharged the several duties which have been from time to time committed to you.'

Mr. Hill then firmly but respectfully represented to the chancellor of the exchequer, that 'he had been expressly appointed by the Treasury to assist in making the *necessary alterations* for the penny postage ;' and that 'amongst those necessary alterations, there were several which remained to be effected, and the want of which greatly impaired the efficiency of the plan as regards its general utility, and at the same time had a very injurious effect on its fiscal results.'†

Mr. Hill then details at great length in a schedule to his letter the various requisites yet wanting to the due completion of his plan, and is driven in self-justification to the exposure of the *causes* of their delay and frustration, which amply prove the necessity of *his* lynx-eyed superintendance and honest devotion to the execution of the plan !

'It may perhaps be urged that all this can be accomplished without any aid from me, that the plan being thus far in operation, its completion may safely be left to the post-office authorities. Of course this is a

* July 11th, 1842.

† July 29th, 1842.

point on which I touch with reluctance, since I am unwilling to speak on the subject of my own ability, and yet more averse to question the claims of others; still there are facts so unquestionable and so important, that in my present peculiar circumstances, I must not hesitate to refer to them. In the first place then, it is well known that from the beginning *the plan has experienced no favour from the post-office*; that it was forced on that department after a most determined opposition, accompanied by many positive and reiterated statements, of which not a few are already proved to be erroneous; and by condemnation of the measure so publicly and so emphatically uttered, that its success could not in the nature of things be otherwise than displeasing to those by whom they were pronounced. I had hoped that this lamentable feeling of hostility would by this time have died away. I assure you that it has been my anxious desire to remove it, and that I have striven to do so by all means of conciliation consistent with the discharge of the duty with which I have been entrusted. Nevertheless, that unfortunately it still continues unabated, is a truth which cannot be gainsaid, and which I think must have attracted your attention, since you have seen it evinced by the treatment of my offer of assistance in the introduction of a cheaper system of registration, which was considered by the post-office as presenting insurmountable difficulties; and further by the obstacles recently raised to my even making the enquiries necessary to the economical introduction of a valuable improvement; enquiries, too, which I was not only empowered to make by the general authority conveyed in the minute of my appointment, but which has been sanctioned by the Treasury in the particular instance. Again, much of the opposition to the various improvements which it has been my duty to urge, has been founded, as I am fully prepared to show, *on great misapprehension as to the existing facts of the case*; and to test the truth of this allegation, I respectfully but earnestly request that you will subject to rigid examination some one of the questions now in dispute between the post-office and myself. I would suggest, for instance, the statements relative to the registration of letters, and if you will allow me an opportunity of laying the details of this matter either before you or before any impartial and intelligent person whom you may depute, I pledge myself to show that *the opposition made to the plan of cheap registration which I proposed, is founded* the present system. Considering the ample opportunities of obtaining *on a total misapprehension as to results daily produced* by the working of correct information possessed by the gentlemen of the post-office, it may appear rash in me to make such a declaration, but I do it advisedly, and beg that its correctness may be subjected to the severest scrutiny. *I submit then, that the task for which I was appointed is as yet unfinished*, that its incompleteness has not resulted from any neglect on my part; that although the improvements which remain to be introduced are for the most part among the less striking features of the plan, *they will not require less care or be attended with less difficulty in the execution* than those portions which have been brought into operation; and consequently, that there is *the same necessity for my assistance now as at first*, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether, under these circumstances, it would be just to deprive me of all opportunity of completing my labours.'

Mr. Hill's views were adopted by the respectable and influential body who so efficiently served the public on a former occasion in helping to carry the plan into an act, the London Mercantile Committee on Postage, who made an unsuccessful application to the prime minister in November, 1842, to 'carry out' his plan. Mr. Hill then presented a petition to the House of Commons, praying for inquiry. The petition was brought before the House last session by Sir Thomas Wilde, in a speech characterized by clearness of statement, fullness of information, and cogency of argument, and eventually the minister consented to the prayer in a modified form. A select committee was appointed 'to inquire into the measures which have been adopted for the general introduction of a general rate of postage, and for facilitating the conveyance of letters, and the result of such measures, so far as relates to the revenue and expenditure of the post-office and the general convenience of the country, and to report their observations thereupon to the house.' The committee consisted of fifteen members, with a majority of one to the ministerial portion. The report of the evidence examined by the committee contains three hundred and sixty-four pages of examination of witnesses, two hundred and sixty pages of appendix of documents, and nearly fifty of index alone! We take for granted that very few of our readers will be tempted to wade through such a mass, and hope we are performing a useful task in directing their attention to the chief points contained in it.* Mr. Rowland Hill is first examined, and at such length, that his evidence occupies one hundred and thirty-four pages. Colonel Maberly, secretary of the post-office, then appears on the scene, and he takes up another hundred pages. He is followed by the various officers of the post-office department, Mr. Robert Smith, superintending president of the twopenny post; Mr. William Bokenham, superintending president of the inland office; Mr. John Ramsey, superintendent of the missing letter department, and last, not least, Lord Lowther, the great postmaster-general himself. The committee, with a majority of ministerialists, did not venture to pronounce a verdict of acquittal of the post-office authorities on the various charges brought forward by Mr. Hill against them; but although unable to agree to a *specific* report, from the mass of evidence and the lateness of the session, they recommend Mr. Hill's proposals to the public consideration.

The two great divisions into which the case developed in the evidence presents itself are—1st. The results already produced by the adoption of Mr. Hill's plan; and 2nd. The requisites to

* Mr. Hill's pamphlet mentioned at the head of this article is an able summary and scrutiny of the material points included in this interesting inquiry.

its due completion. To these two important heads of inquiry, justice adds a third, suggested by the petition of Mr. Hill, on which the committee was founded, viz.: his own dismissal from the office he was filling with so much honour to himself, so much satisfaction to the government (according to the statements of *both* chancellors of the exchequer), and so much benefit to the public, albeit we fear with too much *trouble* to the post-office authorities. We shall treat the subjects separately.

1st. We are truly gratified to find *how much* has been already effected.

'1st. The uniform and low rate of one penny has been adopted as the general postage through the United Kingdom. 2nd. Weight has been adopted as the only standard for increase of charge. 3d. By arrangements made with that view, the public have been brought into the habit of pre-payment, double postage being levied where this is neglected, and facility being afforded by the introduction of stamps. This plan, however, though general, is not yet universal. 4th. Day mails have been established on most of the principal lines from London; in most instances, indeed, this was done previous to the adoption of my plan, though I must add that the earliest of them was established subsequently to my recommendation of such additional mails. 5th. One additional delivery has been established in London, and two additional deliveries on some of its suburbs. Again, in some of the provincial towns, an additional delivery has followed the establishment of day mails. To these may perhaps be added an additional delivery in some few other places. The additional delivery in London, and one of the additional deliveries in the suburbs, were established previously to the adoption of my plan, but all subsequently to its announcement. 6th. In regard to the foreign and colonial letters, the inland rates, as recommended in my evidence, have been greatly reduced, in some instances they have even been abandoned altogether. 7th. The sea rates on divers of the foreign and colonial letters have themselves been lowered. 8th. The privilege of franking has been abolished, and a low charge imposed on the transmission of parliamentary papers. 9th. Arrangements have been made to admit the registration of letters, though on a fee so high as to constitute a most serious obstacle to the use of the privilege. 10th. The use of money orders which was formally recognized, and placed on a more liberal footing about five years ago, and the amount of which was at once doubled by the introduction of the penny rate of postage, has again undergone a most important extension by the adoption of a recommendation, which I had the honour to make to the Treasury for the lowering of the money order fees. The present fees which were virtually fixed by the post-office are so moderate as to open the plan to general use. 11th. An especial arrangement has been made, whereby the ordinary limitation in the weight of packets to one pound has been waived in favour of bankers' parcels and law papers.*'

* Evidence of Mr. Hill. Report p. 8.

Again :—

‘ *Results of the Improvements already effected.*—In considering these results it will be necessary to take into account *the extreme depression* of trade which existed when the penny rate was established, and has continued to prevail ever since,—the very imperfect manner in which the plan has been carried into effect, the want of due economy in the post-office, the well-known dislike to the measure entertained by many of those persons to whom its execution has been entrusted, and the influence such dislike must necessarily have had on its success.

‘ *Number of Letters.*—The chargeable letters delivered in the United Kingdom, exclusive of that part of the government correspondence which heretofore passed free, *have increased from about 75,000,000 in 1838, to 207,000,000 in 1842.* At the commencement of the present year, these letters were at the rate of 219,000,000 per annum, or nearly threefold the former amount. The London district post letters have increased from about 13,000,000 to 23,000,000 per annum, or nearly in the ratio of the reduction of the rates, notwithstanding that the additional deliveries, on which I so much relied, have not yet been established.

‘ *Expenses of the Post Office.*—The increase of expenditure, as shewn by the returns, is from £757,000 in 1839, to £978,000 in 1842, or £221,000, of which about a half is, *on account of the substitution of railway for common road conveyance*, of money orders, and compensation for loss of fees, together with payments to foreign countries for transit postage, and the charges for conveying the letters of the post-office itself, which last two are mere matters of account. These several items of expenditure have no connexion with penny postage, though some of them undoubtedly tend to augment the gross receipts of the post-office. Making these necessary deductions, the increase of expenditure is about 15 per cent; and even including the whole, it is only 30 per cent; while the increase of letters and newspapers combined is about 100 per cent; thus showing how much the plan, even in its present imperfect state, *has by introducing simplicity tended to economy in the management of the post-office.*

‘ *Revenue of the Post Office.*—The growth of the post-office revenue, both gross and net, is seriously affected by the reductions which from time to time are made in the foreign rates and by the gradual substitution, on the part of the public in general, of pre-paying at a penny, for payment on delivery at twopence; and the net revenue is still more affected by the too frequent disregard of economy, *still it has steadily increased while every other branch of revenue has declined.* The falling off in the post-office revenue being a mere reduction of taxation, implies no loss to the community. The tendency of free communication by post to improve the general revenue of the country, has been forcibly shown in the evidence of Mr. George Moffat, (Third Report, abstract p. 49,) and Lord Ashburton gave his opinion to the same effect, (Evidence, p. 132.)

‘ *Prevention of Breaches of the Law.*—The illicit conveyance of letters is in effect suppressed, at least as regards inland conveyance, except

when owing to imperfections in the post-office arrangements the law is broken to save time. The almost total removal of an habitual disregard of a positive law, habitual amongst all classes of society, must be regarded as a benefit of high social importance.

'Removal of the causes tending to suppress correspondence.'—The evils so ably described in the Third Report of the Select Committee on Postage, (page 20,) are now for the most part removed; commercial transactions, relating even to very small amounts, are managed through the post; small orders are constantly so transmitted, and small remittances sent and acknowledged. Printers send their proofs without hesitation; the commercial traveller has no difficulty in writing to his principal; and private individuals, companies, and associations distribute widely those circulars, always important, and often essential to the accomplishment of their objects. I may mention, however, that I am in possession of various letters, showing some important benefits to commerce, arising from the facility of communication and easy transmission of patterns and light goods; others, great advantages to literature, science, and friendly union evinced by the transmission of scientific specimens—evinced, too, by the production of works, and the formation of even large societies, to the existence of which, as their authors and promoters assure me, the establishment of a penny rate was an essential condition; and others again telling of pains relieved, affections cultivated, and mental efforts encouraged by correspondence, to which the former rates would have acted as an absolute prohibition. Professor Henslow writes as follows: 'That the penny postage is an important addition to the comforts of the poor labourer, I can also testify. From my residence in a neighbourhood where scarcely any labourer can read, much less write, I am often employed by them as an amanuensis, and have frequently heard them express their satisfaction at the facility they enjoy of now corresponding with distant relations. As the rising generation are learning to write, a most material addition to the circulation of letters may be expected from among this class of the population; indeed, I know that the pens of some of my village school children are already put into requisition by their parents. A somewhat improved arrangement in the transmission of letters to our villages, and which might easily be accomplished, would greatly accelerate the development of country letter writers. Of the vast domestic comfort which the penny postage brings to homes like my own, situate in retired villages, I need say nothing.' Invoices are now dispatched by post. Mr. Travers dispatches 10,000 'Prices Current' per annum more than formerly. Samples are now dispatched by post; increase of tea trade increases the duties, consequently the revenue. Mr. Charles Knight, the publisher, says the penny postage facilitates the distribution of books; monthly lists of new books, formerly only sent to the London trade, are now sent to the country booksellers. Country booksellers have now parcels three times a week instead of once; small tradesmen once a week, instead of once a month. Accuracy in books is promoted by cheap transmission of proofs to and fro between author and printer. Want of rural distribution, prevents communication with important classes, such as the clergy, magistrates, poor-law guardians, &c. Messrs. Pickford and

Company's postage for the year ending March 1839, was on or about 30,000 letters; in the year ending March 1843, it was on or about 240,000 letters. Lieutenant Watson, R.N., states that the penny postage has enabled him to complete his system of telegraphs: he has now telegraphs on many of the most important headlands of England and Scotland. Mr. Stokes, the honorary secretary to the Parker Society, (a society that contains among its members nearly all the dignitaries of the church, and many other influential men, among whom is the present chancellor of the exchequer,) states that the society could not have come into existence but for the penny postage; it is for reprinting the works of the early English reformers; there are 7,000 subscribers; it pays yearly from £200 to £300 postage; it also pays duty on 3000 reams of paper. Mr. Bagster, the publisher of a Polyglot Bible in twenty-four languages, shows that the revision which he is giving to this work as it goes through the press, would, on the old system, have cost £1,500 in postage alone; and that the Bible could not have been printed, but for the penny postage, also that the penny postage has added to the accuracy, as he can now send revises to several parties.'

We pass on to the second head: the requisites necessary to complete Mr. Hill's plan. The great desideratum cannot be better put, than in Mr. Hill's own petition.

15. That all your petitioner's efforts *to promote economy and the public convenience*, by introducing the remaining parts of his plan, *have been ultimately frustrated*.

16. That at the expiration of the third year of your petitioner's engagement, viz, on the 14th of September last, when many specific improvements recommended by your petitioner, some involving large savings of public money, were actually in progress, the Lords of the Treasury terminated your petitioner's engagement, thus depriving him of every chance of completing his appointed task.

17. That the plan of post-office improvement, thus left incomplete, has from the first been stated by your petitioner to consist of the following parts:—1. A uniform and low rate of postage. 2. Increased speed in the delivery of letters. 3. Greater facilities for their dispatch. 4. Simplification in the operations of the post-office, with the object of reducing the cost of the establishment to a minimum.

18. That the *only* portion of the plan which is *as yet* fully carried into effect, is *the institution of the penny rate*.

19. *That for increased speed in the delivery, or greater facilities for the dispatch of letters, little or nothing has been done.*

20. That with regard to the simplification of arrangements, and consequent economy, though many important and successful changes have been made, yet little has been effected in proportion to the opportunities afforded by the adoption of uniformity of rate and pre-payment.

21. That the opinion which your petitioner expressed, both in his pamphlet and in his evidence before the committee of your honourable House, was to the effect that the maintenance of the post-office revenue,

even to the extent on which he calculated, (about £1,300,000 a year,) *depended on carrying into effect the plan as a whole.*

22. That the opinion adopted by her Majesty's government, that the further progress in post-office improvement may be left to the post-office itself, *is contrary to all past experience*, and is contradicted by measures recently adopted by that establishment.

23. That the questions to which your petitioner sought to gain the attention of the Treasury involve savings to the extent of hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum; an advantage to the revenue entirely independant of that augmentation of letters which the whole experience of the post-office shows may safely be anticipated from the adoption of those measures suggested by your petitioner, which have reference to increasing the utility of the post-office to the public.

24. That notwithstanding the extreme depression of trade which existed when the penny rate was established, and has continued to prevail ever since; and notwithstanding the very imperfect manner in which your petitioner's plan has been carried into effect; the want of due economy in the post-office; the well-known dislike to the measure entertained by many of those persons to whom its execution has been intrusted; and the influence such dislike must necessarily have had on its success; yet the results of the third year of partial trial, as shown by a return recently made to the House of Lords, are a gross revenue of two-thirds, and a net revenue of more than one-third of the former amount.

27. That looking to these results, your petitioner trusts your honourable House will see no reason to doubt that a few years, with a revived trade, would suffice to realize all the expectations which he held out, *provided the whole plan be carried into effect with zeal and economy.*'

In an appendix to the pamphlet recently published by Mr. Hill, and of which we have given the title at the head of this article, he has drawn together in four pages* statements of the post-office authorities contradictory to each other and to themselves, which would be truly amusing, were it not lamentable to think into what hands such important interests are entrusted, and how necessary a scrutineer has been unceremoniously and injuriously withdrawn from their supervision. The first question is, Do the post-office expenses increase in the same ratio as the number of letters? Here Mr. Bokenham and Lord Lowther are at issue, as they are also on the second—Was the post office establishment equal to its task on the introduction of penny postage? On the third question, Does a low rate prevent illicit conveyance? Colonel Maberly in 1838 is quite at variance with himself in 1843. Mr. Bokenham gives varying answers on the question, Is the plan of pre-payment profitable and convenient? and differs with Colonel Maberly as to whether

* pp. 45—49.

the exclusive use of stamps would be profitable and convenient, and with Lord Lowther on the propriety of an uniform rate. Colonel Maberly in 1838 thought 'the loss with a twopenny or three-penny rate would be *immense*,' and in 1843 that such a rate would give alone a million revenue! On the question of *fact*, whether any of the government offices under the old system paid foreign postage, Mr. Laurence and Mr. Bokenham are wide as the poles, asunder. On the important point, whether the net revenue of the post-office was derived from inland or foreign letters, Colonel Maberly said that the penny postage brought very little revenue to the country, and that by far the greater proportion of the revenue was derived, as Lord Lowther thought, from *foreign* postage! In the statement are two egregious errors. The first had been adopted by the chancellor of the exchequer on the faith of a return made by the post-office, from which it was *made to appear* that the post-office, instead of affording a net revenue of £600,000 *caused a loss* of about £10,000 per annum. This error, which was subsequently *admitted* before the Postage Committee, was produced, as stated by Mr. R. Hill in his evidence, by an innovation, consisting in charging the *whole cost of the packet service*, £612,850, against the post-office! and the *real* result is that the total net revenue of the post-office, whether determined in the usual manner or by an account accurately adjusted throughout (a due charge for packets being made on one side, and credit given for the expense of conveying newspapers on the other), is about £600,000 per annum. The second egregious error in the Colonel's statement, that the greater proportion of revenue was derived from *foreign* postage, was contradicted by the return itself, which expressly stated that inland letters produced a net revenue of £103,268, and foreign postage a *deficiency* of £113,039, which statement, although true as to the chief revenue being derived from inland letters, was grossly incorrect as to figures. On the next question, Should the post-office be charged with the cost of the packet service? Lord Lowther and Colonel Maberly are completely at variance, as they are on the important fact of the net revenue produced by penny postage. Again, Colonel Maberly in a letter to the East India Company, says—of the letters despatched to China, Australia, &c., that they are very numerous, and in his evidence says they must be very *few*, with the exception of Ceylon! and on the important subject of the extension of rural distribution, Colonel Maberly says, Since the penny postage no additional post-offices have been set up; while Lord Lowther tells us that from September 1839 to August 1843, one hundred and eighty rural posts were established. Colonel Maberly thinks the probable number of rural posts on the government plan will be 'some thousands,'

while Lord Lowther calculates them at four hundred ; and Colonel Maberly estimates the cost at £30 each for some thousands, while Lord Lowther estimates the *total* expense at £7,000 or £8,000 ! So much for post-office wisdom, consistency, and experience !

The great point which presents itself on these suggestions is the importance of arrangements for increasing *the facilities* of post-office communications, only second in value, and efficacy to *cheapness*. The first point *has been* secured for the people ; and unless they are false to themselves, the second must follow also. The public is only less indebted to Mr. Hill for his admirable suggestions on this subject, than for his grand and comprehensive project of a low and uniform rate. The following most interesting and instructive extract from Mr. Hill's evidence, shows the inevitable tendency of judicious increase of the facility of correspondence, eventually to increase the revenue.

' Palmer's adoption of mail coaches, though accompanied with repeated advances of postage, increased the number of letters threefold in twenty years, and the new facilities of transmission afforded by the Manchester and Liverpool Railway, increased the number of letters between the termini about fifty per cent. probably, in six years, postage remaining the same, although previously the number had for some years been gradually declining. It has since been ascertained that the establishment of day mails has greatly increased the number of letters. So likewise has the establishment of the North American Steam Packets, to an extent, it is said, more than sufficient to compensate for the reduction of the rate. The overland Indian mail, too, has greatly augmented the correspondence with our Indian possessions, and in May 1842, the combined operation of steam navigation and the penny charge (increased facilities and reduced rates), had been to increase the number of letters in the Shetland Isles more than elevenfold in six years. Again when in 1831 a reduction of postage took place as regards part of the suburbs of London, the post-office calculated on a loss of £20,000 a year, instead of which there was in a few years a gain of £10,000, a result which Mr. Smith, the superintendent of the department, attributed rather to the increased facilities which were offered to the public than to the reduction in the rate of postage. In November 1837, an additional delivery was given in London, and in July 1838 in the suburbs, the effect was a considerable increase in gross, and some in net revenue ; and Mr. Banning, the postmaster of Liverpool, in his evidence before the postage committee, stated it as his opinion, that a great many deliveries, facilities for sending letters, and quickness of despatch, must be the best way of raising the revenue. In short, as stated by Colonel Maberly in his evidence, it is always found in the post-office, as a general rule, *that increased accommodation produces an increased quantity of letters*. Nor is the rule confined to the British post-office. It appears from the valuable work of M. Piron, a gentleman holding a high position in the French post-office, that a reduction in the time of transmission from Paris to Marseilles from one hundred

and eighteen to sixty-eight hours, doubled the number of letters between those cities. The *poste rurale*, too, has not only conduced greatly to the convenience of the French nation, but it has added largely to the net revenue of the post-office. The *poste rurale* was established in 1830, and it extends to every commune in France. A box is fixed against a wall in each village, into which the letters are dropped, and in most cases once a day, but in some once in two days a rural letter carrier comes round and conveys the letters to the nearest post-office, delivering letters as he goes along. By these means 9,000 rural letter-carriers serve 34,000 communes, the remaining 3,000 communes having post-offices of the ordinary description. The cost of the *poste rurale* is about £165,000 per annum, the additional penny (a decime) charged on each letter amounts to about £70,000, but this of course is the least important part of the produce, the chief advantage is felt in the general postage revenue. In the eight years preceding the establishment of the *poste rurale*, the gross revenue of the French post-office (the accounts do not show the net revenue) increased about 6,000,000 of francs. In the eight years following the increase was 11,000,000 of francs, or nearly twice as much, and the revenue has for some years been steadily increasing at the rate of about five per cent. per annum, an increase which is attributed by M. Piron chiefly to the *poste rurale*.'

Mr. Hill then goes minutely into the various suggestions for improving the present arrangements of the post-office, in which our space will not allow us to follow him; and of which the main features are presented in his pamphlet. We must content ourselves with a few observations on each of these heads:—

'*London District Post*.—In London, make the collection and delivery of letters once an hour, instead of once in two hours, and establish district offices, so as to avoid the necessity of making all letters, as at present, pass through St. Martin's le Grand. In the principal suburbs make some increase in the frequency of delivery of letters, and much more in their receipt and transmission to London, where comparative frequency of delivery is already provided for. As regards the compact parts of those suburbs which can be reached by the night mails, say by a quarter before nine, effect a delivery the same night instead of the following morning, as at present. The preceding arrangements would probably reduce the time necessary for an interchange of letters by one half, and if combined with other improvements which I have recommended, might be effected with little or no additional expense, and without adding to the labour of the men.'

'*London General Post Delivery*.—There is no doubt that with little or no additional expenditure, and without increasing the labour of the men, the delivery might be completed, even in the remote parts of London, by nine o'clock.

'*Hour of closing the London letter boxes*.—Restore the old hours, by taking in late letters at the receiving houses (at least, those at which money orders are paid) from five to six p. m. The district offices which I have proposed, one of which should be situated near to each railway

station or in the direction of the same, would enable the public to post late letters, selecting in each case the proper office, to a very late hour,—say a quarter past eight—paying the 6d. fee, as at St. Martin's le Grand.

‘*Provincial Offices.*—Make the collections, dispatches, and deliveries more frequent, and reduce the rates on heavy packets as proposed for the London district post. Such improvements do not necessarily involve an increase of expense, especially where, as in many provincial towns, the letter carriers are not fully employed; indeed, in some cases more frequent collections and deliveries, by distributing the work of the office more equally over the day, would make the expense even less. Re-adjust the limits of official delivery, and keep open the letter boxes to the latest convenient hour.’

Then follows a passage truly startling.

‘*Rural Distribution.*—Defects of the present arrangements. Of the 21,000 registrar’s districts comprised in England and Wales, about four hundred, containing a million and a half of inhabitants, have no post-offices whatever. The average extent of these four hundred districts is nearly twenty square miles each, the average population about four thousand. An inspection of the post-office maps will show that even in England, where the ramifications of the post-office distribution are more minute than in any other part of the kingdom, there are districts considerably larger than the county of Middlesex, into which the postman never enters. The great extent of the deficiency is shown by the fact, that while these two divisions of the empire contain about eleven thousand parishes, their total number of post offices of all descriptions is only about two thousand. *Remedies*—Establish an official post in every registrar’s district as directed by Treasury minute of August, 1841. The operation of this minute has, I believe, been suspended by the present government. Extend the system to smaller districts by some such arrangements as the following, viz.—1st. Establish weekly posts to every village and hamlet, increasing the frequency of such posts in proportion to the number of letters. 2. Lay down a general rule, under which places not otherwise entitled to posts may obtain them, (or those entitled may have them more frequently), on payment by the inhabitants in either case of the additional expense incurred, minus a certain fixed sum per thousand letters. Extend the above arrangements, with such modifications as may be needful, to Ireland and Scotland.

‘*Day Mails.*—Complete the system of day mails so as to include all places on the main lines, which can be reached within seven or eight hours from London, that is to say, sufficiently early for an evening delivery. Let the return mails start as late as is consistent with their reaching London about five p.m.

‘*Communication between large towns.*—Defects of the present arrangements. The infrequency of such communication is nearly the sole support of whatever small amount of contraband conveyance still remains. Between towns circumstanced as London and Brighton, Edinburgh and Glasgow, and many others are, this want is severely felt. *Remedy.*—Employ the ordinary mid-day trains for this purpose, the

expense would be trifling. *Registration.*—Reduce the fee, say in the first instance to sixpence, and afterwards as far as may be consistent with sound policy.'

3. The highly important facts presented under the foregoing heads, seem to us, incidentally, but conclusively, to make out the third—viz., the injustice to Mr. Hill, and the injury to the public resulting from his dismissal from the office he was so effectually holding, in the very midst of suggestions and efforts to 'carry out' his beneficent plan. It is very true that Mr. Baring, in the letter quoted at the beginning of this article, does not give Mr. Hill 'a claim' to more than the two years' engagement; but the right honourable gentleman distinctly stated in the House of Commons on the debate on Sir Thomas Wilde's motion, that *he* should certainly have continued Mr. Hill in his office, had he remained in his own. Mr. Goulburn, as we have already seen, concurs with Mr. Baring in approbation of Mr. Hill's services, but states as the reason for his abrupt dismissal: 1st. 'I am influenced solely by the consideration that it is not advisable to give a character of permanence to an appointment which, originally created for a temporary purpose, has now, as it appears to me, fulfilled its object. The penny postage has been above two years established, and the principle of it is now thoroughly understood.*' 'Thoroughly understood!' The foregoing pages will have been written to little purpose if they do not convince every reader that either the principle is thoroughly *misunderstood*, or intentionally and dishonestly *perverted*, by those over whom Mr. Hill was appointed to watch. 'Fulfilled its object!' Not while such blunders exist in the statements and estimates of the post-office authorities; not while the suggestions of Mr. Hill for increased facilities and accommodation in carrying out the plan remain unheeded or unexecuted. 2ndly, says the chancellor of the exchequer, 'The retention of an independent officer for the purpose of conducting such improvements, would necessarily lead either to an entire supercession of those who are by their office responsible for the management of the department, or to a conflict of authorities highly prejudicial to the public interests.' This view is afterwards adopted by Sir Robert Peel.† But, in the first place, Mr. Hill was not 'in authority' at all. He was only an assistant of the Treasury, to whom, and to whom only, he was to 'to suggest' measures of post-office reform. Unless the Treasury *adopted* his suggestions, they were fruitless, and the post-office authorities would be bound to disregard them; and

* Mr. Goulburn to Mr. Hill, August 13, 1842.—Pamphlet, p. 75.

† October 13, 1842, Sir R. Peel to Mr. Hill.

if the Treasury *did* adopt them, the post-office authorities would be equally and imperatively bound to act upon them. So far from there being any 'conflict' of authorities, Sir Robert himself says at the conclusion of his letter, 'The postmaster-general acts under the superintendence and *control* of the Treasury.' Such are the flimsy and inconsistent causes *assigned* as the justification of Mr. Hill's dismissal; but we hope the public will not allow so useful a servant to be thus cashiered of his place, and deprived of his reward. Mr. Hill concludes his able and interesting pamphlet in a tone of dignified self-vindication.

'There is not a single point, I most emphatically declare, from the discussion of which I have the least disposition to shrink; nor, I maintain, *a single material point on which my positions were shaken by the post-office evidence*; all *apparent* effect of the kind being referable to such misrepresentation, distortion, or suppression, however unwittingly employed, as has been exposed in these pages. The parts selected, though more easily put in a striking light, and more important in their consequences than some others which have been passed over, are, nevertheless, but a fair sample of the general mass. I trust I may now be considered as having done all that in me lies towards urging the completion of my plan, and the advancement of post-office improvements in general; as also to evince my perfect readiness, and indeed earnest desire, to bear the whole weight of responsibility, on the sole condition that I may be entrusted with the power, which alone can render that responsibility just or even real. *In the results of the plan*, if fairly and skilfully carried into effect, *I retain undiminished confidence*; indeed, the fact that, to the extent of its execution, its results have fully corresponded with the expectations originally held out, is itself the best guarantee for the success of the whole. I may also appeal to the fact, that in such matters of detail as were committed to my care, the introduction of stamps, for instance, which the post-office denounced as expensive, troublesome, and open to forgery, the success on experiment has remained undisputed. That the present incompleteness of the plan is in no way attributable to me, is fully manifested by my correspondence with the treasury, given in the appendix to this pamphlet; indeed, no charge on the subject has ever been made. The errors now attending the working of the plan, I view with deep regret. Though not in circumstances to disregard the emoluments of office, and far from being so stoical as to slight the pleasure of working out my plan, I believe I can honestly say that my great object has been the measure itself, and that my great regret is to see its benefits impaired or perverted. This, unhappily, I cannot prevent; but I retire with, I hope, the well-founded consciousness of having spared no effort, and with the consolation—I must admit rather a selfish one—of feeling that if the present rash course be attended with loss to the revenue, or ill repute either to the plan or financial improvement generally, these are evils for which I cannot be held in any way responsible.'

Such is the case of Mr. Hill. We think our readers will be satisfied that we have shown how much the public is indebted to that gentleman, not only for already-achieved benefits, but for suggestions only second in importance to the invaluable plan identified with his name; and that the unwillingness, or incompetency, or both combined, which have hitherto thwarted this most useful public officer, where, unfortunately for the public interests, too much adverse power exists, eminently prove the necessity for Mr. Hill's continuance in a position which he has already filled with so much honour to himself and benefit to the people, and to which the voice of the people ought loudly, emphatically, and unanimously to demand his restoration.

We find that a Committee has been formed to procure a national testimonial for Mr. Hill, to which it is confidently anticipated that all classes of her Majesty's subjects will contribute according to their means, for who has not benefited by the postage reformer? This Committee includes men of all politics. Most of the eminent bankers and merchants have given in their adherence to the undertaking, and it is honored by the countenance of Lord Morpeth, and Lord Howick. We cordially wish it success, and shall blush for our countrymen if that success be not great.

Art. VII. 1. *O-Taïti Histoire et Enquête*. Par Henri Lutteroth. 8vo.
Paris. 1843.

- 2 *Correspondence relative to the Proceedings of the French at Tahiti, 1835—1843. Presented to the House of Commons, by the Queen's Command, in pursuance of their Address to Her Majesty, of the 18th of May, 1843.*
- 3 *Correspondence relative to the Society Islands, 1843. In continuation of the Papers presented to the House of Commons in August, 1843.* 1844.

THERE is no spot of civilized territory, how destitute soever of local attractions, and how obscure soever its previous annals, that, if made the scene of a great crime, does not at once concentrate upon itself public curiosity, and acquire a strange interest to the imagination. The cultivated plains which have once been the field of conflict, the humble village which has given its name to a victory, the ruined pile which has borne witness to some deed of darkness and crime, are visited by generation after generation of curious travellers. Almost all the great transactions

which form the staple of history, have taken place within the circumscribed limits of petty territories. Syria and Greece, so long mere provinces of the Ottoman empire, fill a larger space in the annals of the world than the rest of the Eastern Continent.

Ever since it was first visited by Wallis and Cook in 1767—9, Tahiti, the 'New Cythera' of the French Navigators, has, under different aspects, occupied a degree of notice immeasurably disproportionate to its territorial extent, its value as a possession, or its political importance. It has been the theme of florid description, of historical disquisition, of missionary narrative, of political debate. Volumes have been written upon the subject of a group of coral islets, containing a total population not equal to that of a third-rate town in England. Yet, in this miniature territory, moral revolutions have taken place, not less marvellous than the physical changes which have clothed the coral rock with soil, vegetation, and abundance; and the triumph of Christian civilization has justly been regarded as a fact not the less interesting to the philosopher or the philanthropist, because the experiment has been exhibited on so small a scale. Till the last visit of the lamented Williams to his native land, and the publication of his delightful narrative, the English public had not indeed generally taken much interest in the Polynesian missions; and it would seem to be but too true, that the strong feeling which he awakened, has greatly subsided. 'As Tahiti is not English,' remarks a snarling journalist, who at least understands the temper of our political men, 'Englishmen in general scarcely care whether it is left alone, *protected*, seized, or sunk in the sea.' English people care but too little about these things; care very little for the furtherance of British interests in distant territories. The worst is, that even religious people in England, who might be expected to discover more intelligence and less selfish indifference in this respect, as having higher motives for caring for the furtherance of those interests, lie open, too extensively, to the reproach which the sarcasm of the journalist implies. British Protestants cannot, at all events, be charged with having exaggerated the importance of the moral conquests which have been effected by the despised instrumentality of the evangelical missionary in that region. Insignificant as may be these islands, considered as territorial possessions, and circumscribed, therefore, as is the sphere which they present for either commercial enterprise or religious rivalry, they have not eluded the jealous notice of rival powers, or been deemed too mean a prey to attract from its lofty eyrie the vulture of Rome. We find, so long ago as when the notorious Captain Kotzebue visited Tahiti, the hospitality of which he so shamefully abused, (in 1823) from a long conversation which Mr. Nott, the senior missionary, had

with him on the relation in which the islands stood to England, it was inferred, that Russia 'coveted the petty, but merely nominal distinction of adding these green specks within the 'Tropics to the measureless deserts of snow land which constitute her Asiatic empire.' 'There is, however,' it was remarked, 'no disposition at all on the part of the natives to acknowledge such dependence, under the pretext of alliance with the Autocrat of all the Russias; whereas they would be glad to put themselves under the direct guardianship of England.*' Ever since then, during the twenty years which have elapsed since Kotzebue's visit, the degree of watchful attention which those islands have attracted, on the part of foreign navigators and foreign propagandists, hostile to the faith planted by British Protestants, and to the purer and severer morals resulting from it, presents a strong contrast to the contemptuous disregard manifested by the British Government upon the subject. An honourable exception, indeed, demands especial notice. In 1827, George Canning, ever alive to British interests and to the rights of humanity, (a man formed to be a statesman, although condemned to wear the shackles of party,) addressed, as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the following letter to king Pomare, in reply to a formal request to be allowed permission to use the British flag. The letter is at this moment of the more importance as an historical document, because, up to the instructions issued by Lord Aberdeen, subsequently to the piratical outrages of the French Admiral, it was regarded as the authentic exposition of the policy and intentions of the British Government, the standing order by which our officers on that station were to guide their course. The letter is as follows:—

Foreign Office, London, March 3, 1827.

'SIR.—The Missionary, Mr. Henry Nott, has delivered to me the letter which you addressed to the King my master, on the 5th of October, 1825, soliciting His Majesty's friendship and protection, and also requesting permission to use the British flag.

'I have hastened to lay your letter before the King, and have received His Majesty's commands to acquaint you, that, while His Majesty feels every disposition to comply with your wishes, as far as His Majesty can do so with propriety, he regrets that, *consistently with the usages established among the nations of Europe*, it would be improper to grant the permission you solicit to use the British flag.

'His Majesty, however, commands me to say, that although the customs of Europe forbid his acceding to your wishes in this respect, *he will be happy to afford to yourself and to your dominions all such protection as His Majesty can grant to a friendly Power at so remote a distance from his own kingdoms.*

* Tyerman and Bennet's Journal, vol. ii. p. 87.

‘ His Majesty has derived much pleasure from the various accounts which have reached this country, of the beneficial change which has taken place in the moral and social state of the Islands under your government, and of the progressive advancement of your subjects in civilization, through the introduction of the Christian religion, by means of the Missionaries sent out from Great Britain. His Majesty trusts, that the benefits which have been thus, through the exertions of the Missionaries, derived from that religion, may be long continued to your dominions and people.

‘ I have committed this letter to the charge of Mr. Nott, who is about to return to Tahiti. He will present it to you, and will assure you more fully of the friendly dispositions entertained towards you by the King my master.

‘ In conclusion, I recommend you to the protection of the Almighty.
Your faithful friend,

(Signed) GEORGE CANNING.’

To POMARE, Chief of the Island of Tahiti, &c. &c. &c.

We have styled this an honourable exception to the impolitic indifference manifested by successive administrations in this country to the affairs of Polynesia; how justly, is demonstrated by the fact, that, while the official letter of Mr. Secretary Canning has never been disowned, retracted, or annulled, it has not been followed up by any corresponding acts on the part of our Government in fulfilment of the pledge it conveys. Some time before the date of this letter, the astonishing change which had manifested itself in the manners of the Tahitian islanders had begun to excite the wonder of the scornful infidel, and the malign jeers of the licentious. Duperrey, the French navigator, whose *corvette* (the *Coquille*) was the first French vessel of war that had visited Tahiti subsequently to the conversion of its inhabitants,—in his report to the minister of marine, expresses the astonishment he felt at what he witnessed in an island described in such different terms by Wallis, Bougainville, Cook, and Vancouver. ‘The missionaries,’ he says, ‘have totally changed the manners and customs of its inhabitants. Idolatry no longer exists among them. The women no longer come on board the ships: they discover even an extreme modesty when they are met with on shore. . . . All the natives can read and write: they have in their hands books of religion, translated into their own language. Handsome churches have been erected; and the whole population repair twice a-week with great devotion to hear the preacher.’ This honest testimony elicited from many men in France, eminent for their talent or position, expressions of admiration; and among others, M. Guizot himself, in a speech delivered at a general meeting of the friends of Evangelical Missions, in 1826, drew the

following contrast between the missions conducted by Protestants, and those of the Catholics :—

‘The first of these characteristics, that which strikes me at the outset, is, that Protestant missionaries do not go forth to make conquests for the advantage of a church already powerful. They do not extend the domination of an ecclesiastical government : they do not even introduce among the people whom they aim at converting, an external discipline already regulated, an ecclesiastical government ready made. They convey to them simply the faith and the morality of the Gospel. They preach one doctrine for their minds ; one rule for their actions. They labour to reform the inner man, the moral man, the free man. It is to God alone and the Gospel, they require him to yield submission. They leave it afterwards to the word which they have sown, to accomplish the rest, and to organise the Christian community according to places, circumstances, possibilities. I recite numerous instances : the most recent is that presented by the isle of Tahiti, where the entire community, first religiously and morally reformed by evangelical missions, have in turn reformed their own external and civil organization spontaneously, and as it suited them.’

M. Guizot proceeded to specify some other characteristics peculiar to Protestant missions :—

‘The Catholic missionary arrives alone, a stranger to the situation, to the common affections of men ; he is better fitted to acquire an ascendancy, than to awaken sympathy. Protestant missions, on the contrary, are, so to speak, *family missions*. The heathen will be easily led to recognize as brothers, missionaries who are husbands and fathers like themselves. These missions thus present an example of Christian society by the side of the precepts of the faith ; an example of all the social relations, of all the domestic sentiments, regulated according to the morality of the Gospel ; a method of instruction which is assuredly not the least perfect. . . . The Catholic missions have borne to the heathen the faith *and a master* ; while the Protestant missions bear to them the faith *and liberty*.’

Can this be the same M. Guizot who, in 1843, has lent himself, as the supple minister of Louis Philippe, to the project of establishing a Catholic mission in this very island, on the ruins of the faith and morality established by evangelical Protestantism ? In the ‘History and Inquiry’ of M. Lutteroth, from which we have taken the above extract, the testimony borne by M. Hyde de Neuville, formerly Minister of the Marine, to the marvellous transformation of the Polynesian Islanders, is also cited ; as well as the more equivocal language in which that sentimental coxcomb, Chateaubriand, speaks regretfully and sneeringly of Tahiti having lost her dances, her choirs, her voluptuous manners. ‘The beautiful inhabitants of the new Cythera are now transformed, under their bread-fruit trees,

and elegant palms, into puritans, who attend preaching, and read the Bible with Methodist missionaries.' Such a change did not comport with the writer's fantastic idea of the 'genius of Christianity.' Public opinion in France, however, formed itself mainly upon these testimonies of Guizot, Hyde de Neuville, and Chateaubriand. It is only recently that the atrocious calumnies and monstrous fictions of the Russian navigator, Kotzebue, have been adopted, and zealously sustained in all their extravagance and malignity, by such men as Lesson, Laplace, and Du Petit Thouars. The first of these writers,* who accompanied Duperrey, as second surgeon, on board the Coquille, repeats the ridiculous falsehood which attributed the depopulation of the island chiefly to the wars occasioned by the introduction of Christianity; and goes so far as to justify the former impure manners of Tahiti, mourning over their conversion from Pagan idolatry. The pirate admiral, Du Petit Thouars, talks in the same strain; affirming, with a similar contempt for truth, that the persecution by which the new faith had been established, had cost the lives of ten times the number of individuals that had ever been immolated on the collective altars of the whole archipelago of the Society Islands. And in the *Journal des Débats* (the Court journal) of March 27, 1843, we find the same stale and often refuted falsehoods repeated in these words:—

'The English missionaries have carried with them to the Tahitians civil war under its most terrible form,—a religious war, which has desolated them for a number of years; so that of this population, estimated, towards the end of last century, by Captain Cook, at upwards of 130,000 inhabitants, and by Forster at 145,000, there now remain scarcely 8,000.'

Our readers cannot require to be informed, that the civil war which ended in the submission of the whole island to Pomare I., broke out in 1793, four years before the arrival of the first Protestant missionaries; and that the result of the most careful inquiries, anterior to their gaining any influence, gave from 5,000 to 8,000 as the actual number of the population. Since that time, it has considerably increased. But the slightest knowledge of the structure of the island, the whole interior of which is filled with lofty mountains, traversed by a single valley, with only a belt of fertile soil between them and the sea, is sufficient to convince any one, that Tahiti never could have contained or supported a much larger or denser population. The

* Voyage round the World, undertaken by order of Government, in the corvette 'La Coquille'. By P. Lesson, Corresponding Member of the Institute. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1838.

extravagant estimates of Cook and the early navigators were mere conjectures, built upon fallacious data, in the absence of all direct information. Yet, the very ignorance of the first navigators serves the French libellers with the ground of attack upon the Protestant missionaries, in opposition to the evidence of nature herself, to say nothing of statistical facts. Nay the stupidity or malignity of the statement is still further evinced by its requiring us to suppose, that while, in the forty years from 1769 to 1809, the population remained stationary at 130,000, or increased, in spite of wars, human sacrifices, infanticide, licentiousness, and destructive diseases, it had, a few years after that period, been suddenly reduced by religious wars to less than a twentieth of that number. Nineteen twentieths of the people must have fallen by each other's hands, as the result of the introduction of the gospel by the puritan missionaries! The story of the Kilkenny cats which ate up each other, leaving nothing but the tails, is no longer without a parallel. It is by assertions of this character, operating on the credulity and prejudice of the uninformed and sensitive French public, that the King of France and his *protégés* have sought to make out a case, and excite a national feeling in favour of a French protectorate.

The actual designs of the French upon Tahiti date only from the year 1836. On the 21st of November of that year, a small vessel arrived at Papaiti, from Gambier island, having on board two Roman catholic priests, natives of France, named Laval and Caret. In order to account for their arrival, we must go back a few years; and we shall avail ourselves of Mr. Lutteroth's pamphlet, to bring before our readers, in his true character, the prime instigator of all the intrigues and acts of violence from which Tahiti has been and is still cruelly suffering—the ex-American, ex-Gallican consul, M. Mœrenhout.

At the beginning of the year 1828, a Belgian, M. Mœrenhout, arrived at Tahiti. His object was, to lay the foundation of a commercial establishment, and to engage in speculations that might repair severe losses. The more advanced civilization of this island recommended it as the centre of his operations, which required him to enter into relations with all the points of Oceania, including the Gambier islands, one of the groupes nearest to China. These enterprises were not successful. In less than five years, he lost four vessels, one of which entirely belonged to him, and two were half his property. M. Mœrenhout sent his schooner with divers to fish for *nacre* and pearls upon the banks known to him. During this time, he made the islanders cut wood and prepare arrow-root, paying them with clothes and other useful articles. All these productions were afterwards forwarded to Valparaiso. Being of an enterprising spirit,

M. Mœrenhout attempted also to plant the sugar-cane. Twenty acres were brought under cultivation by his exertions ; but this experiment did not succeed. At the end of three years, he abandoned it, estimating his loss at nearly 10,000 francs.

' It may easily be understood, that the arrival of this trader was a very important event for Tahiti. His establishment, which would have been impossible a few years before, was now rendered possible, thanks only to the civilisation introduced by the missionaries. But this new element, which had come to mingle itself with those already described, was in many respects of a contrary character. Up to that time, all had been done with a view to the benefit of the islanders. Their social advancement had been the great, the sole interest ; the mission had no other object. Now, on the contrary, a private interest placed itself in opposition to that general interest, which could not fail occasionally to come into collision with it. For instance, it was proposed to build at Panavia a church of large dimensions, of the wood of the tomana and bread-fruit tree, with doors, windows, and benches. For this purpose, it was necessary to fell the trees, to saw, plane, and polish them, which occupied two or three years. This, says M. Mœrenhout*, was an injury to the merchant, who, reckoning upon arrow-root to form part of his cargoes, found himself deprived of it, because the Indians, necessarily occupied with other things, could only exchange their commodities for articles for the use of the church,—locks, nails, paint.' At other times, the ground of the complaint was, that the various instructions the natives were receiving, or the religious exercises in which they were taking part, hindered them from devoting to the labour which he required of them, as much time as he wished. The mission appeared to him an obstacle to his prosperity ; and he did not perceive that he himself was an impediment to the regular advancement of this people. It might have been said, that it was no longer allowed to the missionaries to study above everything the well-being of the islanders, since that of M. Mœrenhout came into question. Such, if we are not mistaken, was the origin of an ill-will which continued gradually to strengthen, till it at length knew no bounds. In a work which he occupied himself in publishing, during his residence in France, M. Mœrenhout had spoken of the missionaries in the following respectful terms :—' The greater part of the missionaries (I owe them this justice) are amiable men, who have nothing gloomy about them, and no affectation of reserve. Mr. Nott is one of the most cheerful old men you can meet with ; Mr. Wilson, the mildest and best man I ever saw ; Messrs. Pritchard, Simpson, and Osmond, excellent company. I have already spoken of Mr. Davies, who can be appreciated only by those who are intimate with him : he possesses extensive acquirements, for which he is indebted to his love of study and his assiduous application. Mr. Henry has but the fault of being a little too rigid ; otherwise, he is just, upright, and incapable of hurting a human being ; and there is no one, down to Mr. Darling, but you must be pleased with, in your best moments, and from whom you would not find the most frank and cordial hospi-

* ' Voyages aux Iles du Grand Ocean, par J. A. Mœrenhout, Consul Général des États Unis.' 2 vols.

tality.' On several occasions, the missionaries interposed in M. Mœrenhout's favour, in the disputes which he had with the inhabitants. He is especially pleased on this ground with Mr. Davies, who always shewed him, he says, much regard and attention. Mr. Williams had settled some differences which he had with a white established at Raiatea. Moreover, he pays homage to the disinterestedness, the generosity of the missionaries, and adds : 'the missionary Pritchard is deserving here of the highest eulogies.' It is the more necessary to advert to this expression, inasmuch as M. Mœrenhout afterwards entertained towards him very different sentiments. M. Mœrenhout repels several charges invented by other travellers. He admits the horrible character of the ancient manners, and attributes to Christianity the change ; yet, this change inspires in him no sympathy. 'Everywhere we worship the same God. Taaora and Jehovah are alike but names,' is his language. It must be confessed, this was not the language of the missionaries. If M. Mœrenhout was afraid of their influence, they might well have some reason for dreading his. The schism between them became wider and wider.

'But another cause still must have increased the disagreement. The trade carried on by M. Mœrenhout, according to his own confession, was attended with the most fatal consequences to the morals of the island. He thus describes them :—'The little vessels and the divers which I had sent to the Pomontou Isles, to fish for nacre, those which I had sent to procure tortoise-shell, those which I had despatched to Chili, and received in return, my transactions with all the principal inhabitants of Tahiti, with the vessels that visited the island, and that now became every day more numerous—all this had given to the locality an importance which attracted to it strangers of all classes ; especially smiths, carpenters, coopers, sailors, and, unhappily, also, greater numbers of vagabonds, deserters, and scoundrels expelled from their ships ; all of whom, had they known how to employ themselves, might easily have found means to live in this place, where, as it was, they did a great deal of mischief ; for they were all drunkards, quarrelsome, setting an example of debauchery and a horrible life, unheard-of even among the Indians. These excesses on the part of foreigners, could not fail to have a disastrous influence on the natives : they became such, that, had there not been a season at which very few vessels visit the island, it would have become impossible to live there.' These deplorable effects were especially felt in the ports, where the unbridled licentiousness of the sailors spread drunkenness and debauchery. By this means were revived, to the disgrace of the seducers, those frightful scenes on board the ships, which Christianity had abolished, and which brought back the times of Bougainville. Is it astonishing that these disorders, which threatened to replunge the island into a moral debasement equal to that from which it had been with so much trouble rescued, should have filled the missionaries with anxiety ? M. Mœrenhout admits that the establishment he had formed was the occasion of it : can we blame them for having regarded him as a scourge ?

'M. Mœrenhout had hitherto quitted Tahiti only to visit the islands of Oceania, or to make a few trips to Chili, when, in 1834, a voyage to Europe appeared to him necessary to the success of his operations. He

embarked on the 23rd of April; proceeded to the United States; solicited and obtained there the title of Consul, of which he wished to avail himself, on his return, to increase his importance; and arrived in France at the end of the same year.'

Thus far we have closely adhered to M. Lutteroth's narrative, in which, it will be seen, he has cited as his authority, M. Mœrenhout's own testimony, in the volumes referred to; and we have deemed it important that this man's character and motives should be fully understood. We must now drop him for a while, to take a rapid view of the collateral projects of the Romish propagandists in the South Seas; still availing ourselves of the pamphlet before us, but without confining ourselves to the writer's language.

As far back as 1826, the successful operations of the Protestant missionaries, British and American, in this region, had awakened the jealousy of the Church of Rome; and an abortive attempt was made in that year, to establish a Romish mission in the Sandwich Islands. The work interrupted by this failure was not relinquished. A decree of the Propaganda, confirmed by Leo XII., June 2, 1833, confided to the Society of Piepus* the gigantic task of bringing within the pale of the Romish Church all the islands of the North and South Pacific Ocean, from the Sandwich Islands to the Antarctic circle. In pursuance of this decree of 1833, a young priest of the house of Piepus, M. Etienne Rochouse, was nominated Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Oceania, with the title of Bishop of Nicopolis *in partibus*. M. Chrysostom Liangsu, appointed Prefect Apostolic of all the southern part of this division of Oceania, preceded him in this mission, accompanied by two priests belonging to the same congregation, already mentioned; Mess. Francois d'Assise Caret and Honoré Laval, to whom was attached an Irish Catechist, M. Columban Murphy. They arrived at Valparaiso May 13, 1834, where the Prefect took up his residence, in order to maintain the connexion between the missionaries and the house of Piepus, while his companions repaired to the Gambier Isles. They arrived there in August, 1834; and, according to their own account, met with marvellous success, by the help of the Virgin and St. Michael, in converting the heathen inhabitants to the worship of the good Mary, the Mother of God, and in

* The Society of Piepus, founded by an ecclesiastic named Coudrin, who devoted himself to the education of youth, in a house of the street which has given its name to the association, was organized shortly after the Restoration, July 1814, with the double object of reviving the Roman Catholic faith in France, and of propagating it among the heathen. Pope Pius VII. sanctioned it by a bull. By this title, it connects itself with three other French congregations as well as with those of the Lazarists, the Marists, and the powerful society for the propagation of the faith, established at Lyons.

teaching them that, as 'God has no wife, and Jesus Christ has no wife,' no married man can be a true missionary of Jesus Christ and St. Peter.' Monseigneur Etienne (Rouchouse), the Vicar Apostolic, embarked at Havre, in October 1834, attended by three priests and three catechists, and reached Akena in May following. Our limits will not allow us to dwell upon the characteristic proceedings of 'Bishop Stephen' and his assistants in these islands; yet, it is not unimportant that we have, in their own letters, a sufficient illustration of the religion which they proposed to substitute for Protestantism in all the archipelagoes of the Great Ocean; a religion of forms, and symbols, and holy names, from which every Christian idea was utterly excluded. The conquest of idolatry, however, was a trivial achievement in their estimation, compared with the greater work of expelling heresy; and upon this, in fulfilment of their mission, they were anxious to enter without delay. In May, 1836, the Catechist Colomban was sent to the Sandwich Islands, disguised as a simple mechanic. He touched at Tahiti in his way, having orders to ascertain what facilities it presented for an establishment. Being the first representative of the Roman Church who had set his foot on this island, his arrival could not but enrage the enemy of all good, whom he represents as the special patron of the Protestant missionaries. Nevertheless, he obtained permission to remain, though his real capacity was known; and he spent there a little more than a month. In his letters to Bishop Stephen, while urging him to repair in person to this important post, he expressly informs him of the law of the island, which rendered it necessary for the reception of a foreigner, that the Queen and the chiefs should unite in deciding whether he should remain or not. The existence of this law has since been stoutly denied. Instead of the bishop, the two priests, Caret and Laval, responded to the appeal of brother Colomban; and, embarking on board a little schooner which was returning to Tahiti, they arrived at that island, 'partly idolatrous and partly heretical,' October 20, 1836; effected a clandestine landing by stratagem, at a point of the island remote from the port; and making their way to Papaiti, repaired to the house of M. Mœrenhout, who had by this time returned to prosecute his mercantile schemes, and was prepared to cooperate with them by giving them his protection and support. On the 25th, he accompanied them to the Queen, to whom, in the presence of several chiefs, and 'the missionary Pritchard,' they were permitted to make their formal request of being allowed to remain in the island. They were told, that the Queen could not give them an answer: it was necessary to convoke a meeting of the chiefs to decide upon it. Before they

withdrew, the priests made the Queen a present of a shawl, to which they added four ounces of silver; but, as this very nearly represented the value of the sixty piasters which the payment for the right of residence would have amounted to, in case the permission to stay had been granted, this silver was sent back to them the same day, lest its acceptance should be construed into a tacit authorisation of their remaining. They brought it a second time, believing, they said, 'that the cause of religion required them to make these offerings of silver.' Pomare Vahine then accepted it; but, in order that there might be no room for misunderstanding her intention, she sent back some presents in return. This, however, remarks M. Lutteroth, has not prevented M. Du Petit Thouars from saying, that she accepted a payment for the right of residence, and M. de Carné* from interpreting her acceptance of it in the same sense.'

Our account of what passed in the subsequent assembly of the chiefs (November 18), is taken from the annals of the Romish missionaries themselves. M. Mœrenhout again attended them. When they had taken their seats, a judge rose, and thus addressed them:—

'Tavara (Laval), and Tareta (Caret): why have you come to this land? We have *oroméduas* (missionaries) who have been here a long time, and who have instructed us in the Word. We have no need of you. There is a law which forbids your entrance to this land: why have you come hither? Return to Mangareva. You have made presents to the Queen, who has made you some in return. Do not be obstinate in remaining.'

M. Caret's reply is stated to have been as follows:—

'When we set out from Mangareva, we did not expect to find here a queen, chiefs, or a people who would drive us from their land. We knew that those who have brought you the Word of God have calumniated our doctrine, and have brought against us false accusations. We are come to justify the doctrine which we preach. We are not sufficiently acquainted with your language to manifest the truth at present. Wait till we shall know it: do not send us away; otherwise, you will never be able to distinguish the truth from falsehood. This law, of which you speak, is so new, that the American Consul here present, who ought to be acquainted with it, knows nothing of it.'

M. Mœrenhout then rose and said:—

'This law, which interdicts foreigners to enter this island, if it is not the good pleasure of the government, is new and unknown to me. It is contrary to the right of nations. I protest against it. It is injurious to America, on behalf of which I exercise here the functions of consul.'

The palpable falsehood of this declaration is incontestibly

* 'Revue des Deux Mondes.' April 15.

demonstrated; first, by the letter of Columban to Rouchouse, expressly informing him of the law; secondly, by the attempts of the French missionaries to evade the law; and, thirdly, by the testimony borne by M. Mœrenhout to the existence of those disorders which had rendered necessary the renewal and enforcement of this ancient law of the island.

The assembly broke up without conceding the permission to stay; and the next day, the Queen wrote word to Messrs. Laval and Caret, that they could not be allowed to remain any longer.

Upon this, they hastened to her, to try and persuade her to revoke her determination, and to repeat the reasons which made them desirous of remaining.

'These *oroméduas* (missionaries), Queen,' they said, 'are not the messengers of God: but we have been sent by God to make known to you the true Word; and we will prove it when we know the language. They are, you say, the first. Simon, the magician, also went first to Rome to teach his errors. St. Peter went there second, to confound him, and proclaim the truth.'

Paying no attention to the Queen's letter, the two priests took up their quarters in a house which M. Mœrenhout had provided for them. There, in defiance of repeated messages from the Queen, they shut themselves up; till at length, officers charged with the execution of the Queen's orders, adopted a summary mode of ejectment by unroofing the house, and, having gained an entrance, they carried the two foreigners to the shore, where a canoe was in waiting to conduct them to the schooner which had brought them. M. Mœrenhout accompanied them to the sea, and said:—'Gentlemen, I cannot protect you against this act of violence, because I have no troops at my disposal; but they shall know some day, that I am *Consul of the United States*.' After a fruitless endeavour to effect a second landing, and an attempt equally unsuccessful to establish themselves in a low islet constantly visited by the Tahitians, the two discomfited missionaries directed their course back to the Gambier islands, and arrived there on the last day of the year, 1836.

Such are the facts, according to the account given by M. Caret himself; in which, it is observable, that no charge is brought against the Protestant missionaries, of having taken any part in their expulsion, notwithstanding the open avowal that they, the French priests, came to destroy their work. Mr. Pritchard is the only missionary mentioned in M. Caret's recital; and he does not represent him as having taken any prominent or responsible part. Every thing was decided and done by the chiefs. Mr. Pritchard was, in fact, at this time

acting, not as a missionary, but as British Consul ; in which capacity, he had certainly as good a claim as Mœrenhout had to be present at the assembly of the chiefs ; and he acted, we presume, as interpreter also. Up to this time, he appears moreover to have been on as friendly terms with the Belgian adventurer as their opposite characters would admit of. Previously to the final decision of the assembly of chiefs, at the request of the Queen, Mr. Pritchard wrote a letter (No. 3, in the parliamentary papers) to Viscount Palmerston, dated Tahiti, November 19, 1836 ; and the Queen herself, at the same time, addressed a letter to his lordship (No. 4), to inquire 'the opinion of the British Government.' The question put, on the part of Queen Pomare, was, whether Tahiti, being acknowledged by the British Government as an independent nation, hoisting her own flag, had not power to enact laws for her own government, so long as they did not contravene the laws of nations. One of the Tahitian laws, Mr. Pritchard states to be : 'That no master or commander of a vessel shall land any passenger without the special permission of the government.' Whereas, there were several Frenchmen who were determined to land and reside on the island, as Roman Catholic missionaries. Queen Pomare, in her letter, states, that they asserted they were sanctioned in the step they had taken by the British Government ; and asks : 'Is this true ? Are they really sanctioned by the British Government ? Is it suitable they should come here and disturb the peace of my government ?' These letters were received at the Foreign Office, June 16, 1837. Viscount Palmerston's reply, dated July 19, disclaims any knowledge whatever of the intruders, and any right on the part of the British Government, to give or to withhold a sanction to their residence in a territory not appertaining to Great Britain. 'Of course,' adds his lordship, '*every government has a right to refuse to any foreigners permission to reside within its dominions, if the presence of such foreigners is considered hurtful to the state* ; but, if no such reason exists for requiring foreigners to depart, it is contrary to the usual rules of international hospitality to force them to leave a country in which they may wish to take up their abode, provided they do not infringe the laws of the land.' We cannot think that this reply was what Queen Pomare had reason to expect. The question related not to rules of hospitality, but to the right of an independent state to refuse permission to foreigners to settle in its territory ; a right which, if it belongs to a government at all, must be absolute and not conditional upon any reason for its exercise, good or bad. It is no moral justification of inhospitality or intolerance, that a man has a right to shut his door

against one who asks for relief or protection, or to refuse to have any dealings with a person of another religion ; but his legal right to do so cannot be questioned. Viscount Palmerston's reply might be construed thus : ' You have undoubtedly such a right ; but I would not advise you to exercise it.' Or it might be read : ' If you think the intrusion of these foreigners hurtful to the state, you will, of course, send them about their business.' But it overlooked the main point ; that a Tahitian law forbade the landing of any passenger without the permission of the government, and that these French Missionaries had effected a landing, and were determined to reside in defiance of that law ; —a law of necessary precaution, primarily designed to prevent the settlement of runaway convicts and sailors, which it might have been discreet or otherwise to extend to Roman Catholic Missionaries, but the open contravention of which could not be submitted to by any government, without an abandonment of its rightful authority.

— Far from shewing any inhospitality to foreigners, the Tahitian government made no difficulty in receiving M. Pompallier, who, some months afterwards, touched at Tahiti, on his way to New Zealand, as vicar apostolic, in company with the before-mentioned brother Columban. With this prelate, Mœrenhout entered into relations which bound him by the ties of interest to the Catholic mission. He let to the vicar apostolic a schooner belonging to him, at the rate of 400 piasters per month : that is, 4,800 piasters a-year. A similar vessel had been purchased at Hawaii for 3000 piasters !

Early in 1837, M. Caret, accompanied this time by M. Maigret, again set sail for Tahiti. Not being allowed to land there, they proceeded to Valparaiso, but ' not without the hope of one day penetrating into that fortress of Protestantism in the bosom of the Great Ocean.' They had dedicated the projected mission to ' Our Lady of the Faith ;' and ' it shall not be said,' they exclaimed, ' that error shall triumph over the truth : the august Mary, whom the church styles the destroyer of all heresies, will be able to annihilate it at Tahiti.* Mœrenhout had undertaken to teach the Tahitians what an American consul could do ; but when the government of the United States was informed of his conduct, he was deprived of his office. M. Caret was equally determined to shew that a priest could not be insulted with impunity ; and proceeding to Valparaiso, he there embarked for France, in order to interest the government in his cause, and ' solicit reparation.' About the time of his arrival in France, by a singular coincidence, an affair took place, which M. Lutteroth adduces as a counterpart to what had occurred at

* *Annales de la Propagation, &c.* No. 56, p. 234.

Tahiti, and which put to the test the toleration of the French Government. A Swiss protestant minister, M. Delafontaine, had, at the invitation of the inhabitants, come to Montargis, to preach, having given previous notice to the mayor of the place, of the day on which he proposed to celebrate public worship.

* But, in this land of liberty of worship, the mayor opposed his coming on the ground of Art. 294 of the Penal Code, and gave him notice that, if he persisted in his determination to preach, he should be placed, to his great regret, under the disagreeable necessity of reporting this infraction of the law, and of referring it to the magistrate charged with prosecuting the offence. Are we in France or in Tahiti? Matters, it may be supposed, did not rest there. Encouraged by the neighbouring pastor, and by several of his French co-religionists, who saw their own rights compromised by the interdict pronounced against him, M. Delafontaine preached. He then received a formal notice to discontinue his functions, on the ground, not only of the Article (294) mentioned by the mayor, but also on that of a new law, a certain law respecting associations, of which the very minister of justice who threatened to enforce it, had solemnly declared in the national senate, that it should never be applicable to such cases. He ordered the prefect to write word, that, if he (M. Delafontaine) persevered in his illegal resistance, it would be indispensable to have recourse to rigorous measures. The prefect added, '*Force doit rester à la loi.*' At Montargis, as at Tahiti, the law remained in force.'

M. Delafontaine was condemned by the court at Montargis, Nov. 15, 1837, on this law against associations, to two months' imprisonment, with the intimation, that he would be more severely dealt with on a repetition of the offence; and he was ultimately compelled to flee the country, leaving others to maintain in France the principle of liberty of worship. 'The parallel is deficient in one respect,' remarks M. Lutteroth: '*We have not heard that the Helvetic Diet have demanded reparation.*'

M. Caret proceeded from Paris to Rome, where he met with every encouragement from the Pope; and he returned to Paris at the precise moment when a closer alliance had been formed between the Holy See and the French Government, the effects of which have been felt in other quarters besides Oceania. From the king and queen of the French, he met with the warmest reception.

M. Caret sailed again for Oceania at the end of May, 1838. Orders from the French Minister, M. de Rosamel, had preceded him. M. Du Petit Thouars, then commanding the Venus, (of whose previous exploits in the Northern Pacific, our limits forbid us here to take notice,*) received at Valparaiso des-

* M. Lutteroth remarks, that it would be unjust to Du Petit Thouars, to throw upon him the responsibility of his violent proceedings at Tahiti; inasmuch as his conduct under similar circumstances at the Sandwich Islands,

patches from his government, directing him 'to exact reparation from Queen Pomare, and to demand damages and compensation for Messrs. Laval and Caret, so unjustly ill-treated, and so outrageously compelled to take their passage to return to the places whence they came.' M. Du Petit Thouars himself declares this to have been the principal object of his visit to Tahiti. On the 27th of August, 1838, the Venus cast anchor in the road of Papaiti. His first business was, to see M. Mœrenhout, whom he had formally met in Chili; and having received from him an exaggerated version of the horrible persecution sustained by the two French missionaries, without making any further inquiry, he proceeded to execute his commission, by issuing the letter to Queen Pomare, demanding, within twenty-four hours, a written apology to the King of the French, and a sum of 2,000 dollars, as an indemnification to Messrs. Laval and Caret, for the loss occasioned to them by the bad treatment they had received. A translation of this document, and a copy of the 'Convention,' dictated to the Queen and her chiefs by the French commander, were forwarded by Mr. Consul Pritchard, to Viscount Palmerston, November 9, 1838; together with a letter from Queen Pomare and her chiefs, to Queen Victoria, earnestly and pathetically imploring British protection. These documents will be found in the first series of parliamentary papers (pp. 3, 6). 'I have also,' writes Mr. Pritchard, 'enclosed a copy of a law, passed by the Tahitian legislative body, by which your lordship will perceive that the Protestant faith has now become the religion of the state.' This law is dated November 8, 1838, the day before the despatches were sent off by Her Majesty's ship 'Fly.' The Venus, as well as the two French corvettes, Astrolabe and Zélé, which had called at Tahiti, had sailed about the middle of September. It appears, therefore, that this ill-advised 'law' was passed after the departure of the French, in the delusive hope that it would conciliate the favour of the British Government, and interest it in the maintenance of the Protestant faith. The Queen and her chiefs must have been well aware that they were utterly unable to enforce the law against foreigners. In the letter to Queen Victoria, they say:—'In our utter impossibility to make ourselves strong and respected, we are threatened in what we have dearest to our hearts, our Protestant faith and our nationality. We have nobody to assist us in our helpless situation, except you, who implanted in our hearts, through your people, the love of Jehovah, the love of order and industry.' It seems difficult

had been totally different. 'He did not then dream of acting as agent of the Propaganda: the impulsion came to him from France.'

to understand, therefore, with what other view this first and last edict of religious intolerance could have been adopted, than to have its effect in this country, where the doctrine of a state religion and the establishment principle are so much in vogue with the ruling powers. We shall not be understood as defending the law, in thus endeavouring to account for its adoption. It was a very foolish act; and we should be extremely sorry to believe that Mr. Consul Pritchard or any of the missionaries had a hand in advising the measure. It becomes the Society of which they are the agents, to institute a rigid inquiry on this point; and we await the result before pronouncing any opinion. Such a law could neither justify what was past, nor form an available barrier against future intruders. Laval and Caret had been expelled, not as dissenters or religious offenders, but as foreigners landing without permission, in contempt of the rightful authority of the Queen. Had *this* law been then in existence, they might have complained of their expulsion on such ground as religious persecution. It was therefore most impolitic, to pass such a law of intolerance in favour of Protestantism, which it could not be supposed the French propagandists would respect, and which seemed rather to challenge fresh aggression. Accordingly, when, in April, 1839, Commodore La Place arrived at Tahiti, in the *Artemise*, he repaid the hospitable succour afforded him, and the aid rendered by the natives in repairing his frigate, by insisting on the abrogation of this law, under the threat of landing five hundred men to subvert the government. From that period, the Catholic missionaries have had equal liberty with all others.

In Viscount Palmerston's despatch of September 9, 1839, (parliamentary papers 1, 7,) acknowledging the letter and enclosures of the previous November, no comment is made upon the 'law' above-mentioned; but the request of the Queen and chiefs to be placed under British protection is absolutely refused. We have read this document, we must confess, with much pain and regret. What we complain of is, not that the British Government should have thought proper to decline the tendered sovereignty of the Society Islands, but that it should thus virtually have withdrawn protection which was pledged to the Tahitian sovereign by Mr. Secretary Canning; for, between the protection of '*good offices*,' and '*all such protection*' as His Majesty can grant to a friendly power, at so remote a distance from his own kingdoms, there appears to us a vast difference. '*Good offices* may mean nothing more than making feeble remonstrances through a senile ambassador at Paris, to the French minister. By *all* the protection that can be afforded, our naval commanders in the

Pacific understood something very different to be intended. How could they suppose that Great Britain would find it more difficult than France, to provide for the defence of persons claiming protection in a quarter of the globe equally remote from both countries? How could they suppose that the British Government would abandon the protection of islands, the whole value of which had been *created* by British enterprise, to a rival maritime power? How could our brave officers, such men as Captains Nicholas, Waldegrave, and Gambier, imagine that the British flag was to be no protection to 'a friendly power,' against an act of piratical aggression as mean and cowardly as it was insulting to this country, having for its avowed object, to force Roman propagandists upon the heretical islanders who had embraced the Protestant faith?

We must very rapidly advert to the subsequent events. The Artemise, Captain Laplace, proceeded from Tahiti to Hawaii, where the doctrine of Romish toleration was imposed upon the Sandwich islanders by the French commander, and a guarantee was exacted of 20,000 piastres. Happily, the further designs of the French upon this important groupe were frustrated by a spirited, but unauthorised occupation of them, in the name of Great Britain, by Lord William Paulet, commanding H. M. ship Carysfort. This act, the British Government lost no time in disavowing; but, at the same time, the British minister at Washington was instructed to announce to the American secretary of state, that Her Majesty had 'determined to recognise the independence of these islands under their present chief.' 'It has not been the purpose of Her Majesty's government,' writes Mr. Fox, 'to seek to establish a paramount influence in those islands for Great Britain, at the expense of that enjoyed by other powers. All that has appeared requisite to Her Majesty's government has been, *that other powers should not exercise there a greater influence than that possessed by Great Britain.*' How different this language from that held by the Earl of Aberdeen to the French minister! Why, when Great Britain had voluntarily relinquished the occupation and sovereignty of the Sandwich islands, to obviate remonstrances from America, was France allowed to act so different a part?

On the return of Du Petit Thouars to France in June, 1839, he was raised to the rank of rear-admiral. It was not till Sept. 1, 1842, that he re-appeared at Papaiti, in the French frigate of 60 guns, the *Reine Blanche*. The Tahitians had been visited, however, in the May preceding, by the *Aube*, a corvette of 24 guns, Capt. Dubuset; and on that occasion, the Queen was subjected to the further humiliation of disbanding her police force, at the command of the French captain, because, in the discharge

of their duty, they had put the commander of a French whaler into confinement for drunkenness and riot. Mœrenhout had meantime been planning the seizure of the island; and in 1841, an abortive attempt had been made at his instigation, in concert with some malcontent chiefs, whom he had gained over. All was prepared by this unprincipled confederate for the French Admiral, who, immediately on his arrival, as before, published a long train of accusations against Queen Pomare, without any attempt to ascertain their truth, or waiting for any explanation, as a pretext for his outragous demands. ‘Ill-advised, submitting to an influence fatal to her true interests, ‘the Queen,’ says Du Petit Thouars, ‘will learn a second time that the good faith and loyalty of a power such as France, is not with impunity to be trifled with.’

Mr. Pritchard was not at this time at Tahiti, having in the interim visited this country. On reaching Sydney, on his return, December 8, 1842, he there learned, that the French had taken possession of the Marquesas, and of Tahiti and Eimeo. His despatch, transmitting this intelligence, was anticipated by information already received at the Foreign-office. Mr. Pritchard reached Tahiti, February 25, in the *Vindictive*, and found Queen Pomare ‘driven from her proper residence by the continual threats made by the French to fire upon her.’ Under the protection of Commodore Nicholas, however, she had returned, at the date of his despatch (March 13), to her own residence. ‘Your lordship will perceive,’ writes Mr. Pritchard, ‘that Queen Pomare is now in those circumstances with another power, which lead her to look to Great Britain for the fulfilment of those promises of protection which have from time to time been made.’ To this despatch, received August 4, 1843, the Earl of Aberdeen replies, by telling Mr. Pritchard, he has *misinterpreted* those passages in the letters of Mr. Canning and Lord Palmerston, which he refers to; and informs him, that it could not be supposed Her Majesty’s government could have intended to engage themselves to interpose their good offices in behalf of Queen Pomare, ‘in such a manner as to incur the almost certainty of collision with a foreign power;’ recommends Queen Pomare to submit to the evil circumstances which her own fears and the intrigues of some of her corrupt chiefs have brought upon her; and enjoins on all Her Majesty’s naval commanders who may visit the islands, ‘as great a degree of forbearance in their conduct towards the French authorities established there, as may be consistent with the true maintenance of the dignity of the British crown and the efficient protection of British rights and interests.’ The recal of Commodore Nicholas forms the best comment upon his lordship’s expressions. In less than two months after the

date of this despatch, of course long before it could have reached Tahiti, Her Majesty's ship, Dublin, was exemplifying the forbearance enjoined, by witnessing the perfidious and ruffianly dethronement of Queen Pomare by this same Du Petit Thouars, on the pretext that she had violated the treaty which gave the sovereignty of the island to France ; the main charge being, that she had hoisted on her own residence a flag made for her by the *British Commodore*.

We have come to the end of the documents before us. Others of later date, which are indispensable to a complete illustration of the question, have appeared in the daily papers. Among them is a letter addressed by Commodore Nicholas to Admiral Du Petit Thouars, dated, Papaiti Harbour, June 4, 1843, giving a plain seaman-like version of the part which the Commodore had felt it his duty to act, and giving his views of the Admiral's unexampled aggression upon the independence of Tahiti. Why this does not appear in the parliamentary papers, we are at a loss to say. In this letter, Captain Nicholas distinctly alludes to Mœrenhout as 'the main instrument of all the evils that have arisen of late in Tahiti ;' and states, that he had been heard to say on more than one occasion, that it should not be his fault, if there was not a war between the two nations, France and England. Captain Nicholas protests against the validity of the treaty to which Queen Pomare's signature had been extorted under circumstances of the most unmanly cruelty ; and he tells the French Admiral, that his course appears the more extraordinary after the letters written to Queen Pomare by Commodore Buglet, his immediate predecessor in the command of the naval forces of France in those seas, only six months before, and those of Captain De Bouzé, of the Aube, written but a few weeks before, (of which copies were in his possession,) 'in both of which were expressed the most perfect satisfaction with all the last measures pursued by the Queen with regard to French subjects in Tahiti.'

All this is in direct contradiction to the assertions made by M. Guizot, in his despatch to the Count de Rohan-Chabot, dated September 11, 1843; (*Correspondence in Continuation*, No. 8;) and imputations are thrown out in that letter, which must not, cannot be suffered to pass without being repelled. What, we beg to ask, is the meaning of the following insinuated charge ?

' We agree with Lord Aberdeen, that the acts of one individual missionary should not have the effect of depriving his brethren of the claim which they have to the protection of the king's government. He likewise agrees with us, that the profession of missionary ought not to protect from just punishment an individual who made it a weapon with which to attack established order, either by violence or by intrigue.

Religious zeal, ever sincere, ought never, and cannot in any case at the present day, serve as a veil to justify and protect criminal designs against governments.'

Is it possible that the Directors of the London Missionary Society can tamely suffer these dark accusations to be brought against any missionaries in connexion with that society, and not insist upon a full investigation of the evidence on which they rest? Of the utter falsehood of the implied charges, we entertain no doubt. There are individuals now in this country, who can at all events say what truth there is in them. Applied to the conduct of Laval and Caret, they would be indeed strictly true. But this cannot be the reference intended. If, however, 'the profession of missionary' cannot protect men of tried, exemplary, irreproachable character against criminal charges, malignantly invented by men of abandoned and desperate character; and if, upon such allegations, British subjects may be liable to punishment at the hands of foreign brigands, such as those to whose honour Lord Aberdeen has consigned the protection of Protestant missionaries in the South Seas; what security, we ask, can our missionaries derive from the delusive assurance, that they shall enjoy entire liberty in the exercise of their religious functions?

Abundant evidence has been afforded in the course of this article, that the seizure of Tahiti is only part of an extended design for the forcible establishment of Roman Catholic missions in all the islands of the Pacific, in which the labours of Protestant missionaries have proved successful; and not in that quarter only. But this does not fully describe the project. It is more particularly for the subversion and extinction of the Protestant heresy, that the Pope, by whom this design is patronised, demands the alms of the faithful. In 1842, the sums collected by the propaganda society of Lyons, amounted to more than three millions of francs; out of which, in the same year, there were granted to the Vicar Apostolic of Polynesia (or Eastern Oceania), for the Picpus missions, upwards of 150,000 francs.* Now this design of extirpating heresy in the South Seas has not been abandoned. It has the full approbation of Louis Philippe, who thereby seeks to gratify the religious zeal of his queen, to conciliate the Pope, and to pander to the almost fiendish hatred of this country breathed by the worst portion of the French press. M. Guizot, the great Protestant minister, the eulogist, in 1826, of Protestant missions—is faithfully following out the crafty schemes of his great master, 'the Napoleon of Peace,' by keeping as long as he can out of a war

* Lutteroth, pp. 231—2.

with this country, and doing England all the mischief he can at the same time. The hollow and harmless accusation brought against the French minister, of subserviency to England, enables him the more successfully to take advantage of the pacific pusillanimity and amiable confidence of good Lord Aberdeen, so as to secure a real subserviency of British interests to the *entente cordiale* with France. In this posture of our foreign relations, it would be absolutely fatuitous to suppose, that the recent disavowal of the late brutal aggression of Du Petit Thouars by Louis Philippe, which at the same time ratifies the French sovereignty over Tahiti, puts out of jeopardy the Protestant missions in the South Seas. A pretext for expelling the English missionaries will soon arise. We shall hear of it under a French version, a year afterwards. A deputation from Blomfield-street will then wait upon the Foreign Office with their complaints. Lord Aberdeen, if still its occupant, will express his concern and regret, and will write to our ambassador at Paris; and our ambassador will ask for a conference with M. Guizot; and M. Guizot will make explanations and assurances, and laugh in his sleeve. The Society of Picpus will, mean time, be singing Te Deum for the success vouchsafed to their pious projects for the extirpation of heresy by the august Virgin, the mother of God; and our Anglican clergy will chuckle over the ruin of missions rashly undertaken by unauthorised evangelical teachers, without a state warrant or a state stipend, without episcopal orders and sacerdotal thaumaturgic gifts. God grant that we may prove false prophets!

Brief Notices.

Annales Veterum Regnum et Populorum, imprimis Romanorum, confecti a Car. Timotheo Zumptio. (Reprinted under the superintendence of Rev. T. Kerchever Arnold). London: Rivington. 1844.

We gladly direct attention to a little work, unpretending in form, but most valuable in substance, to all who are engaged, either as teachers or as pupils, in the study of ancient authors, especially the historians and orators of Greece and Rome. Much has of late been done for Greece: Mr. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, though by far too cumbrous and expensive for school use, is nearly all that the advancing and wealthy university scholar can wish in that department; but there has been a deficiency of accessible books to assist the student of the Roman Annals. The great work of Pighius is very rare in England, and we

believe is nowhere to be purchased; few booksellers have either seen or heard of it: yet undoubtedly something has been done since it was written, and a mere republication of it, without judicious annotations, is hardly to be desired. The excellent commentary of Siganus on the *Fasti Consulares*, was indeed reprinted by the Oxford Clarendon press in 1801; but so entirely has the most important period of Roman history been neglected at Oxford and Cambridge, (viz., that which intervenes from the death of Hannibal to the battle of Actium,) that this useful book is scarcely known. Some years back, when we desired to procure it, great difficulties were experienced; and at last it was obtained from Oxford *in sheets*; there being no sufficient demand for it to induce the booksellers even to put it in boards! Mr. Kerchever Arnold's timely republication of the small volume before us, we regard as a great boon; yet, since for conciseness all references have been omitted, it cannot supersede larger works. Especially we could wish to see Siganus ably edited, and all his references filled up from the figures used in modern editions. But this will come in time; and we hail every mark that history is becoming a more prominent aim in our study of antiquity. Meanwhile, we wish that Mr. Arnold had added a few tables, which might easily have been extracted from accessible works: such as, a list of the Athenian archons, of the parishes of Attica, of the tribes of Rome, of the Chief Pontiffs, the Lustra, and the Principes Senatus, within the most important period. Five pages added to the 209, would have increased the utility of the work to young scholars, with little or no effort. Perhaps this may be done in a second edition.

The chronology of the Roman empire is here carried down to A.D. 476, or the extinction of the Latin sovereignty in Italy. Through a very large part of the volume, the yearly narrative is so full,—being in pure and very concise Latin,—that in reading it, we read no very meagre summary of the history. Zumpt has prefixed an excellent Introduction, containing a succinct account of the *sources* of ancient history, with brief criticisms on their respective value. We have no doubt that this instructive and sterling work will have wide circulation as soon as its nature is understood.

Shakspeare. Library Edition. Edited by Charles Knight. Vol. IX.
London. 1844.

When this beautiful edition of our great dramatist was about half finished, we introduced it in a review of some length to the notice of our readers. We then entered pretty fully into Mr. Knight's merits as a critic and annotator, and can only say that the work still deserves the approbation we then expressed. Of the labours of the editor in his recension of the text, of the value of his critical *excursus*, and antiquarian and archæological annotations, we can only repeat what we then said. When the last volume is published, which is to contain the Life of the Poet, we shall find matter for some further observations. We wait its appearance with considerable interest.

Letters from the Virgin Islands, illustrating Life and Manners in the West Indies. London: Van Voorst.

We do not anticipate that many readers of the Eclectic will be pleased with this volume. It is not, indeed, without marks of considerable talent, but there is an unseemly flippancy, and an affected gaiety which lead us to suppose the writer to be what, in current phrase, is described as a man of the world. The remarks on the condition and character of the female sex, which are very frequently interspersed in the volume, display a freedom which too nearly approaches libertinism. Though according to its title, the book may illustrate life and manners in the West Indies, it is not likely to improve those of our own country. There are occasionally some useful observations on the subject of slavery.

Caste and Slavery in the American Church. By a Churchman. New York and London: Wiley and Putnam, 1843.

'Upright men shall be astonished at this,' is the appropriate motto borne by this pamphlet. It is a powerful denunciation of the guilt of the American Episcopalian clergy in their treatment of the coloured race, and their general connivance at, and silence respecting slavery. Episcopilians in England, who are fond of contemplating their church in America as sustaining towards them the relation of a daughter, might with propriety exercise on this matter parental fidelity and remonstrance.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Preparing for immediate publication.—Critical Essays, contributed to the Eclectic Review. By John Foster, author of Essays on Decision of Character, &c. 2 vols, 8vo.

A Visit to My Father-land; being Notes of a Journey to Syria and Palestine in 1843. By Ridley H. Herschell. 18mo. cloth.

On the 1st of May, 1844, will be published, price threepence, No. I of The Voice of Israel; a new Monthly Journal, conducted by Jews who believe in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah.

Just Published.

Illustrations of the Theory and Practice of Ventilation; with Remarks on Warming, Exclusive Lighting, and the Communication of Sound. By David Reid, M.D., F.R.S.E.

A Series of Compositions from the Liturgy. By John Bell, Sculptor. No. V.

Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By John Kitto, Editor of the Pictorial Bible. Part XI.

The Most Delectable History of Reynard, the Fox, and of his Son Reynardine,—a Revised Version of an old Romance.

Margaret, or the Pearl. By the Rev. Charles B. Taylor, M.A., Author of *May You Like It.*

The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, with the Manual of Epictetus, and a Summary of Christian Morality. Freely translated from the original Greek. By Hugh McCormac, M.D.

Linnæus and Jussieu; or the Rise and Progress of Systematic Botany. A popular Biography, with an historical Introduction and Sequel.

Smeaton and Lighthouses. A popular Biography, with an Historical Introduction and Sequel.

The Useful Arts employed in the Production of Clothing.

Amy Herbert. By a Lady. Edited by the Rev. W. Sewell, B.D.

Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention, called by the Committee of The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and held in London, June, 1843. By J. F. Johnson, short-hand writer.

The History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné. A new translation (the only one containing the Author's latest improvements.) By Henry Beveridge. Vol. I. Second Thousand.

The Young Composer; or, Progressive Exercises in English Composition. Part I. By James Cornwell.

Letters from America. By John Robert Godley. 2 vols.

Western Africa; its Condition, and Christianity the Means of its Recovery. By D. J. East.

The Piedmontese Envoy; or, the Men, Manners, and Religion of the Commonwealth. A Tale. By Prothesia S. Goss.

The Sabbath Companion; being Essays on First Principles of Christian Faith and Practice. Designed especially for the Use of Young Persons. By Thomas Dale, M.A.

The Treasury of History; consisting of a Series of Separate Histories of the Principal States and Kingdoms in the World, preceded by an Introductory Outline Sketch of Universal History from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time. By Samuel Maunder.

Elements of Church History, Vol. I., containing the External History of the Church during the first Three Centuries. By David Welsh, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Church History, New College, Edinburgh.

The Morning Exercises at Cripplegate, St. Giles's in the Fields, and in Southwark; being divers Sermons preached A.D. 1659—1689, by several Ministers of the Gospel in or near London. Fifth Edition. By James Nichols. In six Vols—Vol. I.

Horæ Aramicæ; comprising Concise Notices of the Aramean Dialects in General, and of the Versions of Holy Scripture extant in them; with a translation of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, from the ancient Peschito Syriac. By J. W. Etheridge.